arXiv:math/0612063v2 [math.AP] 20 Dec 2006

BOREL SUMMABILITY OF NAVIER-STOKES EQUATION IN $\mathbb{R}^3$ AND SMALL TIME EXISTENCE

O. COSTIN[1], AND S. TANVEER[1]

February 2, 2008

Abstract. We consider the Navier-Stokes initial value problem,

$$v_t - \Delta v = -\mathcal{P}\left[v \cdot \nabla v\right] + f\ ,\ v(x,0) = v_0(x),\ x \in \mathbb{R}^3$$

where $\mathcal{P}$ is the Hodge-Projection to divergence free vector fields in the assumption that $\|f\|_{\mu,\beta} < \infty$ and $\|v_0\|_{\mu+2,\beta} < \infty$ for $\beta \geq 0, \mu > 3$, where

$$\|\hat{f}(k)\|_{\mu,\beta} = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{R}^3} e^{\beta|k|}(1+|k|)^{\mu}|\hat{f}(k)|$$

and $\hat{f}(k) = \mathcal{F}[f(\cdot)](k)$ is the Fourier transform in x.

By Borel summation methods we show that there exists a classical solution in the form

$$v(x,t) = v_0 + \int_0^{\infty} e^{-p/t} U(x,p) dp$$

$t \in \mathbb{C}$, $\mathrm{Re}\frac{1}{t} > \alpha$, and we estimate α in terms of $\|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu+2,\beta}$ and $\|\hat{f}\|_{\mu,\beta}$. We show that $\|\hat{v}(\cdot;t)\|_{\mu+2,\beta} < \infty$. Existence and t-analyticity results are analogous to Sobolev spaces ones.

An important feature of the present approach is that continuation of v beyond $t = \alpha^{-1}$ becomes a growth rate question of $U(\cdot,p)$ as $p \to \infty$, U being is a known function. For now, our estimate is likely suboptimal.

A second result is that we show Borel summability of v for v_0 and f analytic. In particular, we obtain Gevrey-1 asymptotics results: $v \sim v_0 + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} v_m t^m$, where $|v_m| \leq m! A_0 B_0^m$, with A_0 and B_0 are given in terms of to v_0 and f and for small t, with $m(t) = \lfloor B_0^{-1} t^{-1} \rfloor$,

$$\left| v(x,t) - v_0(x) - \sum_{m=1}^{m(t)} v_m(x) t^m \right| \leq A_0\ m(t)^{1/2}\ e^{-m(t)}$$

1. Introduction and main results

We consider the Navier-Stokes (NS) initial value problem

$$v_t - \Delta v = -\mathcal{P}[v \cdot \nabla v] + f(x)\ ,\ v(x,0) = v_0(x),\quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3,\quad t \in \mathbb{R}^+ \tag{1.1}$$

where v is the fluid velocity and $\mathcal{P} = I - \nabla\Delta^{-1}(\nabla\cdot)$ is the Hodge-Projection operator to the space of divergence free vector fields. We rescale v, x and t so that the viscosity is one. The initial condition v_0 and the forcing $f(x)$ are chosen to be divergence free. We assume f to be time-independent for simplicity, but a time dependent f could be treated similarly. Moreocver, from the analysis presented here, it will be clear that similar results can be obtained for the corresponding periodic problem, *i.e.* $v(.,t) \in \mathbb{T}^3$.

---

[1] Department of Mathematics, Ohio State University.

We first write the equation in the Fourier space. We denote by $\mathcal{F}$ or simply $\hat{}$ the Fourier transform and $\hat{*}$ is the Fourier convolution. Since $\nabla \cdot v = 0$ we get

$$\hat{v}_t + |k|^2 \hat{v} = -ik_j P_k \left[\hat{v}_j \hat{*} \hat{v} \right] + \hat{f} \ , \ \ \hat{v}(k,0) = \hat{v}_0, \tag{1.2}$$

where as usual a repeated index j denotes summation over j $(= 1,2,3)$. If $P_k = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{P})$ we get

$$P_k \equiv \left(1 - \frac{k(k\cdot)}{|k|^2} \right), \tag{1.3}$$

Definition 1.1. *We introduce the norm* $\| \cdot \|_{\mu,\beta}$ *by*

$$\|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu,\beta} = \sup_{k\in\mathbb{R}^3} (1+|k|)^{\mu} e^{\beta|k|} |\hat{v}_0(k)| \ , \ \text{ where } \hat{v}_0(k) = \mathcal{F}[v_0(\cdot)](k), \tag{1.4}$$

We assume $\|\hat{v}_0\|_{2+\mu,\beta} < \infty$, $\|\hat{f}\|_{\mu,\beta} < \infty$ for some $\beta \ge 0$ and $\mu > 3$. Clearly, if $\beta > 0$, then v_0 and f are analytic in a strip of width at least β.

There is considerable mathematical literature for Navier-Stokes equation, starting with Leray's papers in the 1930s [15], [16], [17]. Global existence and uniqueness are known in 2d (see for instance [4] and reference therein). However, this is not the case in 3d. It is not known whether classical solutions exist globally in time for arbitrary sized smooth or even analytic initial data. While weak solutions in the space of distributions are known to exist since Leray, it is not known if they are unique or not without additional assumptions. Only local existence and uniqueness of classical solutions is known, with a time of existence inversely proportional to a Sobolev norm of v_0. There are sufficient conditions that guarantee existence for all times [3], [7], but of course it is unknown whether they are satisfied. The solution, as long as it exists, is known to be analytic in part of the right half complex t-plane [18], [14], [11]. If space-periodic conditions are imposed, for $v_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{T}^3)$, and f analytic, then the solution v becomes analytic in space as well [12], [9].

The purpose of this paper is twofold. One is to introduce Borel transform techniques (the notions are explained in the sequel) in time for nonlinear evolution PDEs. After Borel transform, NS becomes an integral equation in p, the Borel dual variable of $1/t$ (1) The integral equation is shown to have a unique solution in an exponentially weighted space, $L^1(dp\, e^{-\alpha p})$ for some $\alpha > 0$. An important advantage of this formulation is that existence in t of the evolution PDE is transformed into finding the large p-asymptotics of a known solution to an integral equation (finding α). We do not, in this paper, find an optimal α, but only a rough bound which implies existence for $t < \alpha^{-1}$.

A second purpose is to show Borel summability of the formal power series in small t of NS, when initial v_0 and f are analytic. This corresponds to $\beta > 0$ in the norm defined in 1.1. Borel summability implies in particular that the formal expansion in powers of t,

$$\tilde{v}(x,t) = v_0(x) + t v_1(x) + \cdots$$

where v_j can be found algorithmically, is actually Gevrey-1 asymptotic to v. Borel summability also implies that $\|v_m\|_\infty \le m! A_0 B_0^m$, where A_0 and B_0 are determined by v_0 and f.

Borel summability methods have been used by the authors [19] to prove complex sectorial existence of solutions of a rather general class of nonlinear PDEs in $\mathbb{C}^d$

---

(1) If the equation is first order in time and order $n > 1$ in space, then p is dual to $t^{-1/(n-1)}$.

for arbitrary d. This is in some sense a generalization of the classical Cauchy-Kowalewski theorem to PDEs written as systems that are first order in time and higher order in space(2)

The main results in this paper are given by the following two theorems. The results in the first theorem are similar to classical ones, with $\| \cdot \|_{\mu,\beta}$ replacing Sobolev norms.

Theorem 1.1. *If* $\|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu+2,\beta} < \infty$, $\mu > 3$, $\beta \geq 0$, *NS has a unique solution* $v(\cdot,t)$ *such that* $\|\hat{v}(\cdot,t)\|_{\mu,\beta} < \infty$ *for* $\mathrm{Re}\frac{1}{t} > \alpha$. *Here* α *depends on* $\hat{v}_0$ *through (2.39).*

Furthermore, $\hat{v}(\cdot,t)$ *is analytic for* $\mathrm{Re}\ \frac{1}{t} > \alpha$ *and* $\|\hat{v}(\cdot,t)\|_{\mu+2,\beta} < \infty$ *for* $t \in [0,\alpha^{-1})$. *If* $\beta > 0$, *this implies that* v *is analytic in* x *with the same analyticity width as* v_0 *and* f.

Remark 1.2. *Sobolev space methods give local existence of solutions in* H^m *for* $t \in [0,T)$, *where* T *is proportional to* $1/\|v_0\|_{H^m}$. *In particular, for* $m > \frac{7}{2}$, *these solutions are classical solutions (the second derivatives are continuous). The result in Theorem 1.1 is similar, but in a different space. The existence time,* $t = \alpha^{-1}$, *involves* $\|\hat{v}_0\|_{j+\mu}$ *for* $j = 0,1,2$ *(see (2.39)). This solution is classical since* $\|\hat{v}(.,t)\|_{\mu+2,\beta} < \infty$ *for* $\mu > 3$ *implies* $v(.,t) \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

Remark 1.3. *If* v_0 *has finite suitable Sobolev norms, it was known that* v *is analytic in* t *in a region in the right half complex* t *plane. In our setting,* v *is analytic in* $\{t : \mathrm{Re}\ \frac{1}{t} > \alpha\}$ *if* $\|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu+2,\beta} < \infty$.

Remark 1.4. *Previous results* [12] *show that for space-periodic boundary conditions, analytic* f *and* $v_0 \in H^1$, *the solution* $v(\cdot,t)$ *becomes analytic in space, with an analyticity strip improving with time for small time. Moreover, for* $f = 0$, *a uniform estimate on the analyticity strip width for large time exists under the hypothesis that the local dissipation* $\nu\|\nabla v(.,t)\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}$ *is bounded* [9]. *However, we are not aware of similar results in* $\mathbb{R}^3$, *as is the case in this paper. For* $\beta > 0$, *our results of Theorem 1.1 show that the analyticity width is preserved for* $t \in [0,\frac{1}{\alpha})$.

Theorem 1.2. *For* $\beta > 0$ *(analytic initial data) and* $\mu > 3$, *the solution* v *is Borel summable in* $1/t$, *i.e. there exists* $U(x,p)$, *analytic in a neighborhood of* $\mathbb{R}^+$, *exponentially bounded, and analytic in* x *for* $|\mathrm{Im}\ x| < \beta$ *so that*

$$v(x,t) = v_0(x) + \int_0^\infty U(x,p)e^{-p/t}dp$$

Therefore, in particular, as $t \to 0$,

$$v(x,t) \sim v_0(x) + \sum_{m=1}^\infty t^m v_m(x)$$

with

$$|v_m(x)| \leq m! A_0 B_0^m,$$

where A_0 *and* B_0 *depend on* v_0 *and* f, *through (3.55), (3.57) and (3.58)*

---

(2) Also, Cauchy-Kowalewski theorem usually requires a local expansion in all *all* independent variables. Our methods accommodate series type expansion in just one variable.

Remark 1.5. *Borel summability and classical Gevrey-asymptotic results* [2] *imply for small t that*

$$\left| v(x,t) - v_0(x) - \sum_{m=1}^{m(t)} v_m(x) t^m \right| \le A_0 \ m(t)^{1/2} e^{-m(t)}$$

where $m(t) = \lfloor B_0^{-1} t^{-1} \rfloor$. Our bounds on B_0 are likely suboptimal. Formal arguments in the recurrence relation of v_{m+1} in terms of v_m, v_{m-1},...,v_1, indicate that B only depends on β, but not on $\|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu,\beta}$.

Remark 1.6. *For $\beta > 0$ the assumption $\mu > 3$ is not restrictive if β is consistent with the analyticity strips of v_0 and f. This is because $(1+|k|)^\mu e^{-\tilde{\beta}|k|}$ is bounded in k for $\tilde{\beta} > 0$.*

2. Formulation of Navier Stokes equation: Borel transform

We define $\hat{w}$ by

$$\hat{v}(k,t) = \hat{v}_0(k) + t\hat{v}_1(k) + \hat{w}(k,t) \ , \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$\hat{v}_1(k) = \left(-|k|^2 \hat{v}_0 - ik_j P_k \left[\hat{v}_{0,j} \hat{*} \hat{v}_0 \right] \right) + \hat{f}(k) \tag{2.6}$$

From (1.2) we get for $\hat{w}$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{w}_t + |k|^2 \hat{w} = -ik_j P_k &\left[\hat{v}_{0,j} \hat{*} \hat{w} + \hat{w}_j \hat{*} \hat{v}_0 + t\hat{v}_{1,j} \hat{*} \hat{w} + t\hat{w}_j \hat{*} \hat{v}_1 + \hat{w}_j \hat{*} \hat{w} \right] \\ &- t|k|^2 \hat{v}_1 - ik_j t P_k \left[\hat{v}_{0,j} \hat{*} \hat{v}_1 + \hat{v}_{1,j} \hat{*} \hat{v}_0 + t\hat{v}_{1,j} \hat{*} \hat{v}_1 \right] \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

We seek a solution as a Laplace transform

$$\hat{w}(k,t) = \int_0^\infty \hat{W}(k,p) e^{-p/t} dp \tag{2.8}$$

with the property $\lim_{p \to 0+} \hat{W}(k,p) = 0$ and $\lim_{p \to 0^+} p\hat{W}_p(k,p) = 0$. The Borel transform of (2.7), which is the same as the formal inverse-Laplace transform in $1/t$ gives in the dual variable $p > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} p\hat{W}_{pp} + 2\hat{W}_p + |k|^2 \hat{W} + ik_j P_k &\left[\hat{v}_{0,j} \hat{*} \hat{W} + \hat{W}_j \hat{*} \hat{v}_0 + \hat{v}_{1,j} \hat{*} (1 * \hat{W}) + (1 * \hat{W}_j) \hat{*} v_1 \right] \\ + ik_j P_k \hat{W}_j \overset{*}{*} \hat{W} + |k|^2 \hat{v}_1 &+ ik_j P_k \left[\hat{v}_{0,j} \hat{*} \hat{v}_1 + \hat{v}_{1,j} \hat{*} \hat{v}_0 + p\hat{v}_{1,j} \hat{*} \hat{v}_1 \right] = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

where $\overset{*}{*}$ denotes Laplace convolution in p, followed by Fourier convolution in k.

Since the equation $\mathcal{D}y := [p\partial_p^2 + 2\partial_p + |k|^2] y = 0$ has explicit independent solutions in terms of Bessel functions, $y = J_1(z)/z$ and $y = Y_1(z)/z$, where $z = 2|k|\sqrt{p}$ which do not vanish at zero, we formally obtain from (2.9) by inverting $\mathcal{D}$ the Duhamel formulation

$$\hat{W}(k,p) = \frac{ik_j \pi}{2|k|\sqrt{p}} \int_0^p \mathcal{G}(z,z') \hat{H}^{[j]}(k,p') dp' \ , \text{ where} \tag{2.10}$$

$$\mathcal{G}(z,z') = z' \left(-J_1(z) Y_1(z') + Y_1(z) J_1(z') \right) \ , \ z = 2|k|\sqrt{p} \ , \ z' = 2|k|\sqrt{p'} \ ,$$

and

$$\hat{H}^{[j]} = -P_k \left[\hat{v}_{0,j} \hat{*} \hat{W} + \hat{W}_j \hat{*} \hat{v}_0 + \hat{v}_{1,j} \hat{*} (1 * \hat{W}) + (1 * \hat{W}_j) \hat{*} v_1 \right] \\ - P_k \left[\hat{W}_j \overset{*}{*} W \right] + i k_j \hat{v}_1 - P_k \left[\hat{v}_{0,j} \hat{*} \hat{v}_1 + \hat{v}_{1,j} \hat{*} \hat{v}_0 + p \hat{v}_{1,j} \hat{*} \hat{v}_1 \right] \tag{2.11}$$

Remark 2.1. $|\mathcal{G}(z, z')|$ *is bounded for all real nonnegative* $z' \leq z$. *This follows from standard properties of Bessel functions* [1]. *(The approximate bound is about* 0.6.*)*

To obtain stronger results with less regularity of v_0, it is convenient to introduce $\hat{U}(k, p)$ by:

$$\hat{W}(k, p) = \hat{U}(k, p) - \hat{v}_1(k) \tag{2.12}$$

Substituting (2.12) into (2.11), we obtain

$$\hat{H}^{[j]}(k, p) = \hat{G}^{[j]}(k, p) + i k_j \hat{v}_1 \ , \ \text{where } \hat{G}^{[j]} = -P_k \left[\hat{v}_{0,j} \hat{*} \hat{U} + \hat{U}_j \hat{*} \hat{v}_0 + \hat{U}_j \overset{*}{*} \hat{U} \right] \tag{2.13}$$

We can further simplify the integral $\int_0^p \mathcal{G}(z, z') \hat{H}^{[j]}(k, p') dp'$ by noting that the only solution to

$$\mathcal{D} y = -|k|^2 \hat{v}_1, \tag{2.14}$$

satisfying $y(k, 0) = 0$, as it is easy to check, is

$$y(k, p) = -\hat{v}_1(k) \left(1 - 2 \frac{J_1(z)}{z} \right) \ , \ \text{where } z = 2|k|\sqrt{p}, \tag{2.15}$$

where we used the fact that $J_1(z)/z$ is a solution to the associated homogeneous differential equation and that $\lim_{z \to 0} J_1(z)/z = 1/2$. On the other hand, inversion of $\mathcal{D}$ with zero boundary condition at $p = 0$ involves the same kernel $\mathcal{G}(z, z')$. Writing $-|k|^2 \hat{v}_1 = i k_j [i k_j \hat{v}_1]$, it follows that

$$y(k, p) = \frac{i k_j \pi}{2|k|\sqrt{p}} \int_0^p \mathcal{G}(z, z') \left[i k_j \hat{v}_1(k) \right] dp' \tag{2.16}$$

Therefore

$$\frac{i k_j \pi}{2k\sqrt{p}} \int_0^p \mathcal{G}(z, z') \left[i k_j \hat{v}_1(\hat{k}) \right] = \hat{v}_1(k) \left(2 \frac{J_1(z)}{z} - 1 \right) \tag{2.17}$$

From (2.12),(2.13) and (2.17) we get

$$\hat{U}(k, p) \ = \ \frac{i k_j \pi}{2|k|\sqrt{p}} \int_0^p \mathcal{G}(z, z') \hat{G}^{[j]}(k, p') dp' \ + \ 2 \hat{v}_1 \frac{J_1\left(2|k|\sqrt{p}\right)}{2|k|\sqrt{p}} \ =: \ \mathcal{N}[\hat{U}](k, p), \tag{2.18}$$

where $\hat{G}^{[j]}(k, p)$ is given by (2.13).

We will show that $\mathcal{N}$ is contractive in a suitable space, and hence $\hat{U} = \mathcal{N}[\hat{U}]$ has a unique solution. The solution satisfies $\hat{U}(0, k) = \hat{v}_1(k)$, $\hat{U}$ and $\hat{U}_p$ are bounded for $p \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and exponentially bounded at ∞. Then, $\hat{W}(k, p) = \hat{U}(k, p) - \hat{v}_1(k)$ satisfies the integral equation (2.10) and hence the differential equation (2.9) is satisfied, with $\lim_{p \to 0} p \hat{W}_p(k, p) = 0$, $\lim_{p \to 0} \hat{W}(k, p) = 0$, and $\hat{W}$ and $\hat{W}_p$ are exponentially bounded at ∞. Thus the Laplace transform $\hat{w}(k, t) = \int_0^\infty e^{-p/t} \hat{W}(k, p) dp$ will indeed satisfy (2.7) for sufficiently large Re $\frac{1}{t}$, and because of the continuity of $\hat{W}$ at $p = 0$ we have $\lim_{t\to 0^+} \hat{w}(k,t) = 0$. Thus,

$$\hat{v}(k,t) = \hat{v}_0 + t\hat{v}_1 + \int_0^\infty e^{-p/t}\hat{W}(k,p)dp = \hat{v}_0 + \int_0^\infty e^{-p/t}\hat{U}(k,p)dp \tag{2.19}$$

solves the NS equation (1.2) in the Fourier space, with the given initial condition. Furthermore, the sufficiently rapid decay in k of $\hat{U}$ implies that $v(x,t) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\hat{v}(\cdot,t)](x)$ is indeed a classical solution to (1.1). It is known (See *e.g.* [10]) that classical solutions are unique; thus $\hat{v}$ is the only solution to (1.1).

2.1. **Existence of a solution to (2.18).**

First, we prove some preliminary lemmas.

Lemma 2.2. *If* $\|\hat{v}\|_{\mu,\beta}$ and $\|\hat{w}\|_{\mu,\beta} < \infty$*, then we have*

$$\|\hat{v}\hat{*}\hat{w}\|_{\mu,\beta} \le C_0\|\hat{v}\|_{\mu,\beta}\|\hat{w}\|_{\mu,\beta} \tag{2.20}$$

where $\hat{*}$ *denotes Fourier convolution,*

$$C_0(\mu) = 2^{\mu+2}\int_{k\in\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{(1+|k|)^\mu}dk = \frac{32\pi 2^\mu}{(\mu-1)(\mu-2)(\mu-3)}$$

Proof. From the definition of $\|\cdot\|_{\mu,\beta}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}|\hat{v}\hat{*}\hat{w}| &\le \|\hat{v}\|_{\mu,\beta}\|\hat{w}\|_{\mu,\beta}\int_{k'\in\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{e^{-\beta(|k'|+|k-k'|)}dk'}{(1+|k'|)^\mu(1+|k-k'|)^\mu}\\ &\le \|\hat{v}\|_{\mu,\beta}\|\hat{w}\|_{\mu,\beta}e^{-\beta|k|}\int_{k'\in\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{dk'}{(1+|k'|)^\mu(1+|k-k'|)^\mu}\end{aligned}$$

For large $|k|$, we break the integral range at $|k'| = |k|/2$. In the inner ball $|k'| < |k|/2$, we have

$$\frac{1}{(1+|k'|)^\mu(1+|k-k'|)^\mu} \le \frac{1}{(1+|k'|)^\mu(1+|k|/2)^\mu} \le \frac{2^\mu}{(1+|k|)^\mu(1+|k'|)^\mu}$$

while, in its complement,

$$\frac{1}{(1+|k'|)^\mu(1+|k-k'|)^\mu} \le \frac{1}{(1+|k|/2)^\mu(1+|k-k'|)^\mu} \le \frac{2^\mu}{(1+|k|)^\mu(1+|k-k'|)^\mu}$$

Using these estimates, we get for $\mu > 3$,

$$\int_{k'\in\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{dk'}{(1+|k'|)^\mu(1+|k-k'|)^\mu} \le \frac{C_0}{2(1+|k|)^\mu} \tag{2.21}$$

∎

Lemma 2.3.

$$\|P_k\left[\hat{w}_j\hat{*}\hat{v}\right]\|_{\mu,\beta} \le 2C_0\|\hat{w}_j\|_{\mu,\beta}\|\hat{v}\|_{\mu,\beta}$$

Proof. It is easily seen from the representation of P_k in (1.3) that

$$|P_k\hat{g}(k)| \le 2|\hat{g}(k)| \tag{2.22}$$

Therefore, using (1.4),

$$\|P_k\hat{g}\|_{\mu,\beta} \le 2\|g\|_{\mu,\beta}$$

Using Lemma 2.2, with $g = w_j v$, the proof follows. ∎

Lemma 2.4. *For* $C_2 = 2\pi C_0 \sup_{z\in\mathbb{R}^+, 0\le z'\le z} |\mathcal{G}(z,z')|$ [3], *with* C_0 *as defined in Lemma 2.2,*

$$\|\mathcal{N}[\hat U](\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta} \le \frac{C_2}{\sqrt{p}} \int_0^p \left\{ \|\hat U(\cdot,p')\|_{\mu,\beta} * \|U(\cdot,p')\|_{\mu,\beta} + \|v_0\|_{\mu,\beta}\|\hat U(\cdot,p')\|_{\mu,\beta} \right\} dp' + \|v_1\|_{\mu,\beta} \tag{2.23}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathcal{N}[\hat U^{[1]}](\cdot,p) - \mathcal{N}[\hat U^{[2]}](\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta} \\ &\le \frac{C_2}{\sqrt{p}} \int_0^p \Big\{ \Big(\|\hat U^{[1]}(\cdot,p')\|_{\mu,\beta} + \|\hat U^{[2]}(\cdot,p')\|_{\mu,\beta} \Big) * \|\hat U^{[1]}(\cdot,p') - \hat U^{[2]}(\cdot,p')\|_{\mu,\beta} \\ &\qquad + \|v_0\|_{\mu,\beta}\|\hat U^{[1]}(\cdot,p') - \hat U^{[2]}(\cdot,p')\|_{\mu,\beta} \Big\} dp' \end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

Proof. From [1], $|J_1(z)/z| \le 1/2$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and therefore

$$\|2\hat v_1(k) J_1(z)/z\|_{\mu,\beta} \le \|\hat v_1\|_{\mu,\beta}$$

From Lemma 2.3, we have

$$|\mathcal{P}_k \left\{ \hat U_j \overset{*}{*} \hat U \right\}(k,p)| \le 2C_0 \|\hat U(\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta} * \|\hat U(\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta} \frac{e^{-\beta|k|}}{(1+|k|)^\mu}$$

Applying Lemma 2.3, we get

$$\left| \mathcal{P}_k \left\{ \hat v_{0_j} \hat{*} \hat U(\cdot,p) + \hat U_j(\cdot,p) \hat{*} \hat v_0 \right\} \right| \le 4C_0 \|\hat v_0\|_{\mu,\beta} \|\hat U(\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta} \frac{e^{-\beta|k|}}{(1+|k|)^\mu}$$

By Remark 2.1 and the definition of $\mathcal{N}$ in (2.18), it follows that for $C_2 \ge 2\pi C_0 |\mathcal{G}(z,z')|$ (2.23) holds.

The second part of the lemma follows by noting that

$$\hat U_j^{[1]} \overset{*}{*} \hat U^{[1]} - \hat U_j^{[2]} \overset{*}{*} \hat U^{[2]} = \hat U_j^{[1]} \overset{*}{*} \left(\hat U^{[1]} - \hat U^{[2]} \right) + \left(\hat U_j^{[1]} - \hat U_j^{[2]} \right) \overset{*}{*} \hat U^{[2]} \tag{2.25}$$

Applying Lemma 2.3 to (2.25), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \mathcal{P}_k \left\{ \hat U_j^{[1]} \overset{*}{*} \hat U^{[1]}(\cdot,p) - \hat U_j^{[2]} \overset{*}{*} \hat U^{[2]}(\cdot,p) \right\} \right\|_{\mu,\beta} \\ &\le 2C_0 \|\hat U^{[1]}(\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta} * \|\hat U^{[1]}(\cdot,p) - \hat U^{[2]}(\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta} \\ &\qquad + 2C_0 \|\hat U^{[2]}(\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta} * \|\hat U^{[1]}(\cdot,p) - \hat U^{[2]}(\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta}, \end{aligned}$$

from which (2.24) follows easily. ▮

It is convenient to define a number of different norms for functions of (k,p) on $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (\mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\})$

Definition 2.5. *For* $\alpha \ge 1$, *we define*

$$\|\hat f\|^{(\alpha)} = \sup_{p\ge 0} (1+p^2) e^{-\alpha p} |\hat f(\cdot,p)|_{\mu,\beta} \tag{2.26}$$

We define $\mathcal{A}^\alpha$ *to be the Banach-space of continuous functions of* (k,p) *for* $k \in \mathbb{R}^3$ *and* $p \in [0,\infty)$ *for which* $\|.\|^{(\alpha)} < \infty$. *It is also convenient to consider the Banach*

---

(3) Since sup of $|\mathcal{G}| \approx 0.6$, we get $C_2 \approx \frac{32(1.2)\pi^2 2^\mu}{(\mu-1)(\mu-2)(\mu-3)}$

space $\mathcal{A}_1^\alpha$ *of locally integrable* (L^1_{loc}) *functions for* $p \in [0, L)$ *on* $\mathbb{R}^+$, *and continuous in* $k \in \mathbb{R}^3$ *such that*

$$\|\hat{f}\|_1^{(\alpha)} = \int_0^L e^{-\alpha p} \|\hat{f}(\cdot, p)\|_{\mu,\beta} dp \ < \infty \ , \tag{2.27}$$

where L *is allowed to be finite or* ∞. *It is also convenient to define* $\mathcal{A}_L^\infty$ *to be the Banach space of continuous functions of* (k, p) *on* $\mathbb{R}^3 \times [0, L]$ *such that*

$$\|\hat{f}\|_L^{(\infty)} = \sup_{p \in [0,L]} \|\hat{f}(\cdot, p)\|_{\mu,\beta} < \infty \tag{2.28}$$

Lemma 2.6. *For* $\hat{f}, \hat{g} \in \mathcal{A}^\alpha, \mathcal{A}_1^\alpha$ *or* $\mathcal{A}_L^\infty$, *we have the following the following Banach algebra properties:*

$$\|\hat{f} \hat{*} \hat{g}\|^{(\alpha)} \le M_0 \|\hat{f}\|^{(\alpha)} \|\hat{g}\|^{(\alpha)}, \text{ where } M_0 \approx 3.76 \cdots$$
$$\|\hat{f} \hat{*} \hat{g}\|_1^{(\alpha)} \le \|\hat{f}\|_1^{(\alpha)} \|\hat{g}\|_1^{(\alpha)},$$
$$\|\hat{f} \hat{*} \hat{g}\|_L^{(\infty)} \le L \|\hat{f}\|_L^{(\infty)} \|\hat{g}\|_L^{(\infty)}$$

Proof. In the following, we take $u(p) = \|\hat{f}(\cdot, p)\|_{\mu,\beta}$ and $v(p) = \|\hat{g}(\cdot, p)\|_{\mu,\beta}$. We observe that

$$\int_0^L u(s) v(p-s) ds \le e^{\alpha p} \left(\sup_{p \in \mathbb{R}^+} (1+p^2) e^{-\alpha p} u(p) \right) \left(\sup_{p \in \mathbb{R}^+} (1+p^2) e^{-\alpha p} v(p) \right) \times \int_0^p \frac{ds}{(1+s^2)[1+(p-s)^2]}$$

The first part of the lemma follows since [19]

$$\int_0^p \frac{ds}{(1+s^2)[1+(p-s)^2]} \le \frac{M_0}{1+p^2}$$

with $M_0 = 3.76 \cdots$. For the second part note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^L e^{-\alpha p} \int_0^p u(s) v(p-s) ds \\ &\quad = \int_0^L \int_0^p e^{-\alpha s} e^{-\alpha(p-s)} u(s) v(p-s) ds \le \int_0^L e^{-\alpha s} u(s) ds \int_0^L e^{-\alpha \tau} v(\tau) \end{aligned} \tag{2.29}$$

The third part follows from the fact that for $p \in [0, L]$

$$\int_0^p |u(s)| |v(p-s)| \le \left\{ \sup_{p \in [0,L]} |u(p)| \right\} \left(\sup_{p \in [0,L]} |v(p)| \right) L$$

∎

Lemma 2.7. *On* $\mathcal{A}_1^\alpha$, *the operator* $\mathcal{N}$, *defined in (2.18), satisfies the following inequalities, with* C_2 *defined in Lemma 2.4:*

$$\|\mathcal{N}[\hat{U}]\|_1^{(\alpha)} \le C_2 \sqrt{\pi} \alpha^{-1/2} \left\{ \left(\|\hat{U}\|_1^{(\alpha)} \right)^2 + \|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu,\beta} \|\hat{U}\|_1^{(\alpha)} \right\} + \alpha^{-1} \|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta} \tag{2.30}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathcal{N}[\hat{U}^{[1]}] - \mathcal{N}[\hat{U}^{[2]}]\|_1^{(\alpha)} \\ &\le C_2 \sqrt{\pi} \alpha^{-1/2} \left\{ \left(\|\hat{U}^{[1]}\|_1^{(\alpha)} + \|\hat{U}^{[2]}\|_1^{(\alpha)} \right) \|\hat{U}^{[1]} - \hat{U}^{[2]}\|_1^{(\alpha)} + \|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu,\beta} \|\hat{U}^{[1]} - \hat{U}^{[2]}\|_1^{(\alpha)} \right\} \end{aligned} \tag{2.31}$$

while in $\mathcal{A}_L^{\infty}$, *we have*

$$\|\mathcal{N}[\hat{U}]\|_L^{(\infty)} \le C_2 L^{1/2} \left\{ L \left(\|\hat{U}\|_L^{(\infty)} \right)^2 + \|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu,\beta} \|\hat{U}\|_L^{(\infty)} \right\} + \|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta} \tag{2.32}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathcal{N}[\hat{U}^{[1]}] - \mathcal{N}[\hat{U}^{[2]}]\|_L^{(\infty)} \\ &\le C_2 L^{1/2} \left\{ L \left(\|\hat{U}^{[1]}\|_L^{(\infty)} + \|\hat{U}^{[2]}\|_L^{(\infty)} \right) \|\hat{U}^{[1]} - \hat{U}^{[2]}\|_L^{(\infty)} + \|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu,\beta} \|\hat{U}^{[1]} - \hat{U}^{[2]}\|_L^{(\infty)} \right\} \end{aligned} \tag{2.33}$$

Proof. For the space $\mathcal{A}_1^{\alpha}$, for any $L > 0$, including $L = \infty$, we note that

$$\int_0^L e^{-\alpha p} \|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta} dp \le \alpha^{-1} \|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta},$$

while

$$\int_0^L p^{-1/2} e^{-\alpha p} dp \le \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \alpha^{-1/2} = \sqrt{\pi} \alpha^{-1/2}$$

Furthermore, we note that for $u(p') \ge 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^L e^{-\alpha p} p^{-1/2} \left(\int_0^p u(p') dp' \right) &= \int_0^L u(p') e^{-\alpha p'} \left(\int_{p'}^L p^{-1/2} e^{-\alpha(p-p')} dp \right) dp' \\ &\le \int_0^L e^{-\alpha p'} u(p') \int_0^L s^{-1/2} e^{-\alpha s} ds dp' \end{aligned} \tag{2.34}$$

Therefore, it follows from (2.23) that

$$\int_0^L e^{-\alpha p} \|\mathcal{N}[\hat{U}](\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta} dp \le C_2 \sqrt{\pi} \alpha^{-1/2} \left(\left[\|\hat{U}\|_1^{(\alpha)} \right]^2 + \|v_0\|_{\mu,\beta} \|\hat{U}\|_1^{(\alpha)} \right) + \alpha^{-1} \|v_1\|_{\mu,\beta} \tag{2.35}$$

Furthermore, from (2.24), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^L \|\mathcal{N}[\hat{U}^{[1]}] - \mathcal{N}[\hat{U}^{[2]}]\|_{\mu,\beta} e^{-\alpha p} dp \\ &\quad \le C_2 \sqrt{\pi} \alpha^{-1/2} \left\{ \left(\|\hat{U}^{[1]}\|_1^{(\alpha)} + \|\hat{U}^{[2]}\|_1^{(\alpha)} \right) \|\hat{U}^{[1]} - \hat{U}^{[2]}\|_1^{(\alpha)} \right. \\ &\qquad \left. + \|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu,\beta} \|\hat{U}^{[1]} - \hat{U}^{[2]}\|_1^{(\alpha)} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Hence the first part of the lemma follows.
For the second part, we first note that for any $p \in [0, L]$ we have

$$\left| p^{-1/2} \int_0^p u(p') dp' \right| \le \sup_{p \in [0,L]} |u(p)| \sqrt{L} \tag{2.36}$$

We note that

$$\left| \int_0^p y_1(s) y_2(p-s) ds \right| \le L \left(\sup_{p \in [0,L]} |y_1(p)| \right) \left(\sup_{p \in [0,L]} |y_2(p)| \right) \tag{2.37}$$

Taking

$$\begin{aligned} u(p) &= \|\hat{U}(\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta} * \|\hat{U}(\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta} + \|v_0\|_{\mu,\beta} \|\hat{U}(\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta} \\ y_1(p) &= y_2(p) = \|\hat{U}(\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta} \end{aligned}$$

(2.32) follows from (2.23). To bound $\mathcal{N}[\hat{U}^{[1]}]-\mathcal{N}[\hat{U}^{[2]}]$ in $\mathcal{A}_L^{\infty}$, we take

$$u(p)=\Big(\|\hat{U}^{[1]}(\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta}+\|\hat{U}^{[2]}(\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta}\Big)*\|\hat{U}^{[1]}(\cdot,p)-\hat{U}^{[2]}(\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta} \\ +\|v_0\|_{\mu,\beta}\|\hat{U}^{[1]}(\cdot,p)-\hat{U}^{[2]}(\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta} \tag{2.38}$$

$$y_1(p)=\Big(\|\hat{U}^{[1]}(\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta}+\|\hat{U}^{[2]}(\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta}\Big);\ y_2(p)=\|\hat{U}^{[1]}(\cdot,p)-\hat{U}^{[2]}(\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta}$$

in (2.36) and (2.37). The proof now follows from (2.24). ∎

Lemma 2.8. *Equation (2.18) has a unique solution in $\mathcal{A}_1^{\alpha}$ for any $L>0$ (including $L=\infty$) in a ball of size $2\alpha^{-1}\|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta}$, for α large enough to ensure*

$$2C_2\sqrt{\pi}\alpha^{-1/2}\left(\|v_0\|_{\mu,\beta}+2\alpha^{-1}\|v_1\|_{\mu,\beta}\right)<1, \tag{2.39}$$

where $C_2\approx\frac{32(1.2)\pi^2 2^{\mu}}{(\mu-1)(\mu-2)(\mu-3)}$ is the same as in Lemma 2.4. Furthermore, this solution belongs to $\mathcal{A}_L^{\infty}$ for L small enough so that

$$2C_2L^{1/2}\left(\|v_0\|_{\mu,\beta}+2L\|v_1\|_{\mu,\beta}\right)<1, \tag{2.40}$$

In particular, $\lim_{p\to0}\hat{U}(k,p)=\hat{v}_1(k)$. Also, $\hat{W}(k,p)=\hat{U}(k,p)-\hat{v}_1(k)$ is the unique solution to (2.9) which is zero at $p=0$.

Proof. The estimates of Lemma 2.7 imply that $\mathcal{N}$ maps a ball of size $2\alpha^{-1}\|v_1\|_{\mu,\beta}$ in $\mathcal{A}_1^{\alpha}$ back to itself and that $\mathcal{N}$ is contractive in that ball when α satisfies (2.39). From Lemma 2.7 in space $\mathcal{A}_L^{\infty}$, it follows that $\mathcal{N}$ maps a ball of size $2\|v_1\|_{\mu,\beta}$ to itself and that $\mathcal{N}$ is also contractive in this ball if L is small enough to ensure (2.40). Thus, there is a unique solution in this ball. Since $\mathcal{A}_L^{\infty}\subset\mathcal{A}_1^{\alpha}$, it follows that the solutions are in fact the same.

Using Lemma 2.7, with $\hat{U}^{[1]}=\hat{U}$ and $\hat{U}^{[2]}=0$, we obtain from (2.18),

$$\left\|\hat{U}(k,p)-\hat{v}_1(k)\frac{2J_1(z)}{z}\right\|_L^{(\infty)}\le C_2L^{1/2}\left(L\left[\|\hat{U}\|_L^{(\infty)}\right]^2+\|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu,\beta}\|\hat{U}\|_L^{(\infty)}\right)$$

Since $\|\hat{U}\|_L^{(\infty)}<2\|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta}$, it follows that as $L\to0$,

$$\|\hat{U}(k,p)-2\hat{v}_1(k)J_1(z)/z\|_L^{(\infty)}\to0$$

Since $\lim_{z\to0}2J_1(z)/z=1$, it follows that for fixed k, $\lim_{p\to0}\hat{U}(k,p)=\hat{v}_1(k)$. By construction, $\hat{U}$ satisfies (2.18) iff $\hat{W}=\hat{U}-\hat{v}_1$ satisfies (2.10). From the properties of $\mathcal{G}$ and $\hat{H}^{[j]}$, it follows that $\hat{W}$ will indeed satisfy (2.9) and that it is the only solution which is zero at $p=0$. ∎

Proposition 2.9. *If α is large enough so that (2.39) holds, then for an absolute constant $C_3>0$, the solution $\hat{U}(k,p)$ in Lemma 2.8 and its p-derivative satisfy*

$$|\hat{U}(k,p)|\le\frac{2e^{-\beta|k|+\alpha p}\|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta}}{(1+|k|)^{\mu}}$$

$$|\hat{U}_p(k,p)|\le\frac{C_3e^{-\beta|k|}\|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta}}{(1+|k|)^{\mu}}\left\{\frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{C_2}|k|e^{\alpha p}+|k|^2\right\}$$

In particular, $\hat{U} \in \mathcal{A}^{\alpha'}$ *for any* $\alpha' > \alpha$*, and*

$$|\hat{U}(k,p)| \le \left(\sup_{p \in \mathbb{R}^+} (1+p^2) e^{-(\alpha'-\alpha)p} \right) \frac{2e^{-\beta|k|+\alpha' p} \|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta}}{(1+p^2)(1+|k|)^{\mu}}$$

Proof. With $L = L_0 = \alpha^{-1}$, then (2.40) holds, and therefore $\hat{U} \in \mathcal{A}^{\infty}_{L_0}$. For $p \in [0, L_0]$, we obtain

$$e^{-\alpha p} \|\hat{U}(\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta} < 2e^{-\alpha p} \|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta} \tag{2.41}$$

We now consider $p \in [L_0, \infty)$. We define

$$y(p) = \|\hat{U}(\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta} * \|\hat{U}(\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta} + \|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu,\beta} \|\hat{U}(\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta}$$

We note that

$$\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} e^{-\alpha p} \int_0^p y(p') dp' \right| \le L_0^{-1/2} \left| \int_0^p e^{-\alpha p'} y(p') dp' \right| \le \alpha^{1/2} \|y\|_1^{(\alpha)} \tag{2.42}$$

From (2.18) and (2.39), it follows that for $p \in [L_0, \infty)$

(2.43)

$$|\hat{U}(k,p)| \le \frac{e^{-\beta|k|+\alpha p}}{(1+|k|)^{\mu}} \left\{ C_2 \alpha^{1/2} \left(\|\hat{U}\|_1^{(\alpha)} \right)^2 + C_2 \alpha^{1/2} \|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu,\beta} \|\hat{U}\|_1^{(\alpha)} + e^{-\alpha p} \|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta} \right\}$$
$$\le \frac{2e^{-\beta|k|+\alpha p}}{(1+|k|)^{\mu}} \|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta}$$

By (2.41), (2.43) holds for $p \in [0, L_0]$ as well; hence the bound for $|\hat{U}|$ follows. For $\alpha' > \alpha$, $\|\hat{U}\|^{(\alpha')} < \infty$ because $e^{-(\alpha'-\alpha)p}(1+p^2)$ is bounded if $\alpha' > \alpha$.

Since $\hat{U}$ is a solution to (2.18), differentiation with respect to p implies that

$$\hat{U}_p(k,p) = \hat{v}_1(k) \left(\frac{J_1(z)}{z} \right)' \frac{4|k|^2}{z} + \frac{i k_j \pi}{p} \int_0^p \left\{ \mathcal{G}_z(z,z') - \frac{\mathcal{G}(z,z')}{z} \right\} \hat{G}^{[j]}(k,p') dp'$$

Since the functions $\mathcal{G}_z(z,z')$, $\mathcal{G}(z,z')/z$ and $z^{-1} \left(J_1(z)/z \right)'$ are easily checked to be bounded for $z \ge z' \in \mathbb{R}^+$, there exists $C_3 > 0$, independent of any parameter, so that

$$|\hat{U}_p(k,p)| \le \frac{C_3 |k|}{p} \left| \int_0^p |\hat{G}|(k,p') dp' + C_3 |k|^2 |\hat{v}_1(k)| \right| \le \frac{C_3 |k| e^{-\beta|k|}}{(1+|k|)^{\mu}}$$
$$\times \left[\frac{1}{p} \int_0^p \left(\|U(\cdot,p')\|_{\mu,\beta} * \|U(\cdot,p')\|_{\mu,\beta} + \|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta} \|U(\cdot,p')\|_{\mu,\beta} \right) dp' + |k| \|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta} \right]$$

For $p \in [0, L_0]$, with $L = L_0 = \frac{1}{\alpha}$ satisfying (2.40), we have

$$|\hat{U}_p(k,p)| \le \frac{C_3 |k| e^{-\beta|k|}}{(1+|k|)^{\mu}} \left[\left\{ L_0 \left(\|U\|_{L_0}^{(\infty)} \right)^2 + \|\hat{v}_0|_{\mu,\beta} \|U\|_{L_0}^{(\infty)} \right\} + |k| \|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta} \right]$$
$$\le \frac{C_3 e^{-\beta|k|}}{(1+|k|)^{\mu}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{C_2} |k| + |k|^2 \right) \|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta}$$

For $p \in [L_0, \infty)$ and α satisfying (2.39), we have

$$|\hat{U}_p(k,p)| \le \frac{C_3|k|e^{-\beta|k|+\alpha p}}{L_0(1+|k|)^\mu}\left[\left\{\left(\|U\|_1^{(\alpha)}\right)^2 + \|\hat{v}_0|_{\mu,\beta}\|U\|_1^{(\alpha)}\right\} + |k|L_0e^{-\alpha p}\|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta}\right]$$
$$\le \frac{C_3e^{-\beta|k|}\|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta}}{(1+|k|)^\mu}\left\{\frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{C_2}|k|e^{\alpha p} + |k|^2\right\}$$

Continuity of $\hat{U}$ in p follows from the boundedness of $\hat{U}_p$ for $p \in \mathbb{R}^+$ for fixed k. ∎

Lemma 2.10. *Let $\|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu+2,\beta} < \infty$ and $\|\hat{f}\|_{\mu,\beta} < \infty$, with $\mu > 3$, $\beta \ge 0$. Then NS has a unique solution with $\|\hat{v}(\cdot,t)\|_{\mu,\beta} < \infty$ and $\hat{v}(\cdot,t)$ analytic in t for* $\mathrm{Re}\frac{1}{t} > \alpha$, *where α depends on the initial data (see (2.39)). For $\beta > 0$, this implies v is analytic in x in the same analyticity strip as v_0, f.*

Proof. From (2.6) we see that $\|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta} < \infty$, since

$$\|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta} \le \|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu+2,\beta} + 2C_0\|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu,\beta}\|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu+1,\beta} + \|\hat{f}\|_{\mu,\beta} \tag{2.44}$$

Therefore, when α is large enough to ensure (2.39), it follows that $\hat{U}(k,\cdot)$ and $\hat{W}(k,.) \equiv \hat{U}(k\cdot,.) - \hat{v}_1(k)$ are in $L^1(e^{-\alpha p}dp)$. From Lemma 2.8, it follows that $\lim_{p\to 0}\hat{W}(k,p) = 0$ and Proposition 2.9 implies $\hat{W}_p(k,p)$ (same as $\hat{U}_p(k,p)$) is bounded for $p \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and hence $\lim_{p\to 0^+} p\hat{W}_p = 0$. Since $\hat{U}$ satisfies (2.18), it follows that $\hat{W}$ will satisfy (2.10) and hence (2.9). For $\mathrm{Re}\, t^{-1} > \alpha$, we take the Laplace transform of (2.9) in p, using the fact $\partial_p[p\hat{W}]$ and $p\hat{W}$ vanish at $p = 0$. There is no contribution at ∞ because of boundedness of $e^{-\alpha p}\left(|\hat{W}| + \hat{W}_p\right)$ which follows from Proposition 2.9. It can be checked that $\hat{w}(k,t) = \int_0^\infty \hat{W}(k,p)e^{-p/t}dp$ satisfies (2.7). Therefore,

$$\hat{v}(k,t) = \hat{v}_0 + t\hat{v}_1 + \int_0^\infty \hat{W}(k,p)e^{-p/t}dp = \hat{v}_0 + \int_0^\infty \hat{U}(k,p)e^{-p/t}dp$$

satisfies NS in Fourier space. Since $\|\hat{U}(\cdot,p)\|_{\mu,\beta} < \infty$, it follows that $\|\hat{v}(\cdot,t)\|_{\mu,\beta} < \infty$ if $\mathrm{Re}\,\frac{1}{t} > \alpha$. ∎

Proposition 2.11 (Bounds on $\|\hat{v}(.,t)\|_{\mu+2,\beta}$)**.** *For the solution $\hat{v}(k,t)$ given in Lemma 2.10 for $t \in [0,\alpha^{-1}]$, we have*

$$\sup_{t\le T}\|\hat{v}(\cdot,t)\|_{\mu+2,\beta} < C\left(\|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu+2,\beta}, T\right) < \infty$$

Proof. We note from (1.2) that if we define $V = \nabla v$, then $\hat{V} = \mathcal{F}[V] = ik\hat{v}$ satisfies,

$$\hat{V}_t + |k|^2\hat{V} = -ik\mathcal{P}\left[\hat{v}_j \hat{*} \hat{V}^{[j]}\}\right] + ik\hat{f}\ ,\ \hat{V}_0(k) = \mathcal{F}\left[\nabla v_0\right] \tag{2.45}$$

where $\hat{V}^{[j]} = ik_j\hat{v}_j$. Therefore,

$$\hat{V}(k,t) = e^{-|k|^2t}\hat{V}_0(k) - ik\int_0^t e^{-|k|^2(t-\tau)}\left\{\mathcal{P}\left[\hat{v}_j \hat{*} \hat{V}^{[j]}\right](k,\tau)\} - \hat{f}(k)\right\} \tag{2.46}$$

Therefore,

$$|\hat{V}(\cdot,t)| \le \frac{e^{-\beta|k|}}{(1+|k|)^{\mu}} \Bigg\{ \|\hat{V}_0\|_{\mu,\beta} + |k| \int_0^t e^{-|k|^2(t-\tau)} \left(\|\hat{f}\|_{\mu,\beta} + 2C_0 \|\hat{v}(\cdot,\tau)\|_{\mu,\beta} \| \|\hat{V}(\cdot,\tau)\|_{\mu,\beta} \right) d\tau \Bigg\} \tag{2.47}$$

Let $\mathcal{V}_{T_1}$ be the Banach space of continuous functions g of $k \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $t \in [0, T_1]$ for which

$$\|g\|_{T_1} = \sup_{t \in [0,T_1]} \|g(\cdot,t)\|_{\mu,\beta} < \infty$$

Then, the estimates in (2.47), together with the fact that for any $t \in [0,T]$, $2C_0\|\hat{v}(\cdot,t)\|_{\mu,\beta} \le \tilde{C}\left(T, \|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu+2,\beta}\right)$ imply there exists $C_1(T, \|v_0\|_{\mu+2,\beta}) > 0$ so that

$$\|\hat{V}\|_{T_1} \le C_1 \left\{ \sqrt{T_1} \|\hat{V}_1\|_{T_1} + \|\hat{V}_0\|_{\mu,\beta} + \sqrt{T_1} \|\hat{f}\|_{\mu,\beta} \right\}, \tag{2.48}$$

where we have used the fact that

$$|k| \int_0^t e^{-|k|^2(t-\tau)} d\tau = \frac{1 - e^{-|k|^2 t}}{|k|} \le \sqrt{T_1} \sup_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^+} \frac{1-e^{-\gamma}}{\gamma^{1/2}} \le C_* \sqrt{T_1},$$

for some $C_* > 0$. Thus, thinking of $\hat{v}$ as given in (2.45), the estimates in (2.48) and similar estimates on $\hat{V}^{[1]} - \hat{V}^{[2]}$ show that for $C_1 \sqrt{T_1} < 1$ the right hand side of (2.45) is contractive in $\mathcal{V}_{T_1}$. We choose $T_1 \le T$. Therefore, $\sup_{t \in [0,T_1]} \|\hat{V}(\cdot,t)\|_{\mu,\beta} < \infty$. Since the choice of T_1 depends on C_1, which is independent of $\|\hat{V}_0\|_{\mu,\beta}$, we can repeat the same argument in another interval $[T_1, 2T_1]$ and so on until we span the whole interval $[0,T]$ over which $\|\hat{v}_1(\cdot,t)\|_{\mu,\beta}$ is uniformly bounded.

We can take additional derivative and repeat the same type argument for $\mathcal{F}[D^2\hat{v}] = -kk\hat{v}$ to show that in $\||k|^2 \hat{v}(\cdot,t)\|_{\mu,\beta}$ is also bounded uniformly for $t \in [0,T]$. In this part of the argument, we use the prior knowledge that both $\|\hat{v}(\cdot,t)\|_{\mu,\beta}$ and $\|k\hat{v}(\cdot,t)\|_{\mu,\beta}$ are uniformly bounded in $[0,T]$ and that

$$|k|^2 \int_0^t e^{-|k|^2(t-\tau)} \|\hat{f}\|_{\mu,\beta} d\tau = \|\hat{f}\|_{\mu,\beta} \left(1 - e^{-|k|^2 t}\right) \le \|\hat{f}\|_{\mu,\beta} \sup_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^+} [1 - e^{-\gamma}] \le C \|\hat{f}\|_{\mu,\beta}$$

Combining all the results, it follows that $\|\hat{v}(\cdot,t)\|_{\mu+2,\beta}$ is bounded for $t \in [0,T]$ ▮

Proof of Theorem 1.1. This follows from Lemma 2.10 and Proposition 2.11, noting that $\|\hat{v}(k,t)\|_{\mu+2,\beta} < \infty$ implies $v(x,t) = \mathcal{F}^{-1}[\hat{v}(\cdot,t)](x) \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and so v is a classical solution to (1.1) for Re $\frac{1}{t} > \alpha$, which is known to be unique. From the definition of $\|\cdot\|_{\mu,\beta}$ it follows that $\|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu+2,\beta} < \infty$ and $\|\hat{f}\|_{\mu,\beta} < \infty$ for $\beta > 0$ imply $\|\hat{v}(.,t)\|_{\mu+2,\beta} < \infty$. Thus v preserves the analyticity strip width for $t \in [0, \frac{1}{\alpha})$.

3. ANALYTICITY OF $\hat{U}(k,p)$ AT $p=0$

We now consider the case $\beta > 0$.We note that by Remark 1.6 we can choose $\mu > 3$. The starting point of this section is (2.9), which is satisfied by $\hat{W}(k,p) =$

$\hat{U}(k,p) - \hat{v}_1(k)$. From Lemma 2.8, this is the only solution to (2.9) satisfying $\hat{W}(k,0) = 0$. We seek an potentially alternate solution to (2.9) as a power series,

$$\hat{W}(k,p) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \hat{W}^{[l]}(k) p^l \tag{3.49}$$

Substituting (3.49) into (2.9) and identifying the coefficients of $p^l, l = 0, 1$ we get

$$2\hat{W}^{[1]} = -|k|^2 \hat{v}_1 - i k_j P_k \left[\hat{v}_{0,j} \hat{*} \hat{v}_1 + \hat{v}_{1,j} \hat{*} \hat{v}_0 \right], \tag{3.50}$$

$$6\hat{W}^{[2]} = -k^2 \hat{W}^{[1]} - i k_j P_k \left[\hat{v}_{0,j} \hat{*} \hat{W}^{[1]} + \hat{W}_j^{[1]} \hat{*} \hat{v}_0 + \hat{v}_{1,j} \hat{*} \hat{v}_1 \right] \tag{3.51}$$

It follows from (3.50) and Lemma (2.3) that

$$|\hat{W}^{[1]}(k,p)| \le \frac{e^{-\beta|k|}}{2(1+|k|)^{\mu}} \left(|k|^2 \|v_1\|_{\mu,\beta} + 4C_0 |k| \|v_0\|_{\mu,\beta} \|v_1\|_{\mu,\beta} \right) \tag{3.52}$$

The coefficient of p^l for $l \ge 2$ in (2.9) can be computed as well, using $p^{l_1} * p^{l_2} = p^{l_1+l_2+1} l_1! l_2! / (l_1 + l_2 + 1)!$. Interpreting $\hat{W}^{[0]} = 0$, we get

(3.53)
$$(l+1)(l+2)\hat{W}^{[l+1]} = -k^2 \hat{W}^{[l]} - i k_j P_k \left[\sum_{l_1=1}^{l-2} \frac{l_1!(l-1-l_1)!}{l!} \hat{W}_j^{[l_1]} \hat{*} \hat{W}^{[l-1-l_1]} \right]$$
$$- i k_j P_k \left[\hat{v}_{0,j} \hat{*} \hat{W}^{[l]} + \hat{W}_j^{[l]} \hat{*} \hat{v}_0 + \frac{1}{l} \hat{v}_{1,j} \hat{*} \hat{W}^{[l-1]} + \frac{1}{l} \hat{W}_j^{[l-1]} \hat{*} \hat{v}_1 \right]$$

Definition 3.1. *It is convenient to define the n-th order polynomial Q_n:*

$$Q_n(y) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} 2^{n-j} \frac{y^j}{j!}$$

Lemma 3.2. *If $\|v_0\|_{\mu+2,\beta} < \infty$, for $\mu > 3$, $\beta > 0$, then there exist positive constants $A_0, B_0 > 0$ independent of l and k so that for any $l \ge 1$ we have*

$$|\hat{W}^{[l]}(k)| \le e^{-\beta|k|} A_0 B_0^l (1+|k|)^{-\mu} \frac{Q_{2l}(|\beta k|)}{(2l+1)^2} \tag{3.54}$$

and

$$|W^{[l]}(x)| \le \frac{8\pi A_0 (4B_0)^l}{(2l+1)^2}, \quad |DW^{[l]}(x)| \le \frac{8\pi A_0 (4B_0)^l}{\beta(2l+1)^2}, \quad |D^2 W^{[l]}(x)| \le \frac{16\pi A_0 (4B_0)^l}{\beta^2 (2l+1)^2}$$

Furthermore, the solution in Lemma 2.8, §2 has a convergent series representation in p: $\hat{U}(k,p) = \hat{v}_1(k) + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \hat{W}^{[l]} p^l$ for $|p| < (4B_0)^{-1}$.

Remark 3.3. *Lemma 3.2 is proved by induction on l. For $l = 1$, by (3.52) we just choose*

$$A_0 B_0 \ge \frac{18}{\beta^2} \|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta} (1 + \beta C_0 \|v_0\|_{\mu,\beta}) \tag{3.55}$$

Let now $l \ge 2$. For the induction step, we will estimate each term on the right of (3.53).

Lemma 3.4. *If for $l \ge 1$, $W^{[l]}$ satisfies (3.54), then*

$$\frac{|k|^2 |\hat{W}^{[l]}|}{(l+1)(l+2)} \le \frac{6 A_0 B_0^l e^{-\beta|k|}}{\beta^2 (1+|k|)^{\mu}} \frac{Q_{2l+2}(\beta|k|)}{(2l+3)^2}$$

Proof. The proof simply follows from the (3.54) and noting that for $y \geq 0$

$$\frac{y^2}{(2l+2)(2l+1)} Q_{2l}(y) \leq Q_{2l+2}(y) \ , \ \frac{(2l+3)^2}{(2l+1)(l+2)} \leq 3$$

▮

Lemma 3.5. *If $W^{[l]}$ satisfies (3.54), then for $l \geq 1$,*

$$\frac{1}{(l+1)(l+2)} |k_j P_k \hat{u}_{0,j} \hat{*} \hat{W}^{[l]}| \leq 2^{\mu} \|v_0\|_{\mu,\beta} \frac{9\pi A_0 B_0^l e^{-\beta|k|}}{\beta^3 (2l+3)^2 (1+|k|)^{\mu}} Q_{2l+2}(\beta|k|)$$

$$\frac{1}{(l+1)(l+2)} |k_j P_k \hat{W}_j^{[l]} \hat{*} \hat{u}_{0,j}| \leq 2^{\mu} \|v_0\|_{\mu,\beta} \frac{9\pi A_0 B_0^l e^{-\beta|k|}}{\beta^3 (2l+3)^2 (1+|k|)^{\mu}} Q_{2l+2}(\beta|k|)$$

Proof. We use the estimate (3.54) on $\hat{W}^{[l]}$. From Lemma 6.7 for $n = 0$, we obtain

$$|k_j \hat{W}_j^{[l]} \hat{*} \hat{u}_0| \leq \|v_0\|_{\mu,\beta} \frac{A_0 B_0^l}{(2l+1)^2} \left(|k| \int_{k' \in \mathbb{R}^3} \frac{e^{-\beta(|k'|+|k-k'|)}}{(1+|k'|)^{\mu} [1+|k-k'|]^{\mu}} Q_{2l}(\beta|k'|) dk' \right)$$

$$\leq \frac{\|v_0\|_{\mu,\beta} A_0 B_0^l}{(2l+1)^2} \sum_{m=0}^{2l} \frac{2^{2l-m}}{m!} |k| \int_{k' \in \mathbb{R}^3} e^{-\beta(|k'|+|k-k'|)} (1+|k'|)^{-\mu} (1+|k-k'|)^{-\mu} |k'|^{2m} dk'$$

$$\leq \frac{2\pi \|v_0\|_{\mu,\beta} A_0 B_0^l 2^{\mu} e^{-\beta|k|}}{(2l+1)^2 \beta^3 (1+|k|)^{\mu}} \sum_{m=0}^{2l} 2^{2l-m} (m+2) Q_{m+2}(\beta|k|)$$

$$\leq \frac{2^{\mu+1}\pi}{(2l+1)\beta^3(1+|k|)^{\mu}} \|v_0\|_{\mu,\beta} A_0 B_0^l e^{-\beta|k|} (l+2) Q_{2l+2}(\beta|k|)$$

The first part of the lemma follows by using (1.4) and checking that $\frac{2(2l+3)^2}{(2l+1)(l+1)} \leq 9$ for $l \geq 1$. The proof of the second part is essentially the same since $|\hat{W}_j^{[l]}| \leq |\hat{W}^{[l]}|$.
▮

Lemma 3.6. *If $W^{[l-1]}$ satisfies (3.54) for any $l \geq 2$, then*

$$\frac{1}{l(l+1)(l+2)} |k_j P_k \left[\hat{u}_{1,j} \hat{*} \hat{W}^{[l-1]} \right]| \leq 2^{\mu} \|v_1\|_{\mu,\beta} 9\pi A_0 B_0^l (1+|k|)^{-\mu} e^{-\beta|k|} \frac{Q_{2l}(\beta|k|)}{\beta^3 (l+2)(2l+1)^2}$$

$$\frac{1}{l(l+1)(l+2)} |k_j P_k \left[\hat{W}_j^{[l-1]} \hat{*} \hat{u}_{1,j} \right]| \leq 2^{\mu} \|v_1\|_{\mu,\beta} 9\pi A_0 B_0^{l-1} (1+|k|)^{-\mu} e^{-\beta|k|} \frac{Q_{2l}(\beta|k|)}{\beta^3 (l+2)(2l+1)^2}$$

Proof. The proof is identical to that of Lemma 3.5 with l replaced by $l-1$ and v_0 by v_1. ▮

Lemma 3.7. *If for $l \geq 3$, $\hat{W}^{[l_1]}$ and $\hat{W}^{[l-1-l_1]}$ for $l_1 = 1, ..., (l-2)$ satisfy (3.54), then*

$$\left| \frac{k_j}{(l+1)(l+2)} P_k \left[\sum_{l_1=1}^{l-2} \frac{l_1!(l-1-l_1)!}{l!} \hat{W}_j^{[l_1]} \hat{*} \hat{W}^{[l-1-l_1]} \right] \right|$$

$$\leq 2^{\mu} 36 A_0^2 B_0^{l-1} (1+|k|)^{-\mu} e^{-\beta|k|} \frac{Q_{2l}(\beta|k|)}{\beta^3 (2l+3)^2}$$

Proof. First note that if we define $l_2 = l - 1 - l_1$, then for $l \geq 3$, Lemma 6.9 implies

$$\frac{l_1! l_2!}{l!} \left| k_j \hat{W}_j^{[l_1]} \hat{*} \hat{W}^{[l_2]} \right| \leq A_0^2 B_0^{l-1} \frac{(l_1)!(l_2)!}{l!(2l_1+1)^2(2l_2+1)^2} \times$$

$$|k| \int_{k' \in \mathbb{R}^3} e^{-\beta(|k'|+|k-k'|)} (1+|k'|)^{-\mu} (1+|k-k'|)^{-\mu} Q_{2l_1}(\beta|k'|) Q_{2l_2}(\beta|k-k'|) dk'$$

$$\leq \frac{2^{\mu+1} \pi A_0^2 B_0^{l-1} e^{-\beta|k|}}{3\beta^3 (1+|k|)^\mu} \frac{(2l-1)(2l)(2l+1) l_1! l_2!}{l!(2l_1+1)^2(2l_2+2)^2} Q_{2l}(\beta|k|)$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{l_1=1}^{l-2} \frac{l_1! l_2!}{l!(l+1)(l+2)} |k_j \hat{W}_j^{[l_1]} \hat{*} \hat{W}^{[l_2]}|$$

$$\leq \frac{2^{\mu+2} \pi e^{-\beta|k|} Q_{2l}(\beta|k|)(2l-1)(2l+1)}{3(l+1)(l+2)\beta^3(1+|k|)^\mu} \sum_{l_1=1}^{l-2} \frac{l_1! l_2!}{(l-1)!(2l_1+1)^2(2l_2+1)^2}$$

and the proof follows noting that $\frac{l_1! l_2!}{(l-1)!} = \frac{l_1! l_2!}{(l_1+l_2)!} \leq 1$ and checking $\frac{4(2l-1)(2l+1)}{(l+1)(l+2)} \leq 16$; by breaking up the sum in the ranges: $l_1 \leq (l-1)/2$ and $l_1 > (l-1)/2$ (in which $l_2 \leq (l-1)/2$) it is easily seen that for some $C_* > 0$ and any $l \geq 3$ we have

$$\sum_{l_1=1}^{l-2} \frac{1}{(2l_1+1)^2(2l_2+1)^2} \leq \frac{C_*}{(2l+3)^2},$$

where $C_* = 1.07555 \cdots$ (the upper-bound being achieved at $l = 4$). ∎

Lemma 3.8.

$$|\hat{W}^{[2]}| \leq \frac{e^{-\beta|k|}}{(1+|k|)^\mu} \frac{Q_4(\beta|k|)}{7^2} \left(\frac{A_0 B_0}{\beta^2} + A_0 B_0 \|v_0\|_{\mu,\beta} \frac{2^\mu 36\pi}{\beta^2} + \|v_1\|_{\mu,\beta}^2 \right) \tag{3.56}$$

and therefore $\hat{W}^{[2]}$ *satisfies (3.54) if*

$$A_0 B_0^2 \geq \frac{3 A_0 B_0}{\beta^2} + A_0 B_0 \|v_0\|_{\mu,\beta} \frac{2^\mu 36\pi}{\beta^2} + \frac{C_0}{\beta} \|v_1\|_{\mu,\beta}^2 \tag{3.57}$$

Proof. We use Lemmas 3.4, 3.5 and 2.2 to estimate different terms on the right hand side of (3.53) for $l = 1$. ∎

Proof of Lemma 3.2

We use Lemmas 3.4, 3.5 3.6 and 3.7 to estimates the terms on the right hand side of (3.53) and note that $Q_{2l}(y) \leq \frac{1}{4} Q_{2l+2}(y)$. Hence, combining all the estimates, we obtain for $l \geq 2$,

$$|\hat{W}^{[l+1]}| \leq A_0 B_0^{l-1} \frac{Q_{2l+2}(\beta|k|) e^{-\beta|k|}}{(2l+3)^2 (1+|k|)^\mu}$$

$$\times \left\{ \frac{6}{\beta^2} B_0 + 2^\mu \frac{18\pi}{\beta^3} B_0 \|v_0\|_{\mu,\beta} + \frac{2^\mu 18\pi (2l+3)^2}{(l+2)(2l+1)^2 \beta^3} \|v_1\|_{\mu,\beta} + \frac{9 A_0 2^\mu}{\beta^3} \right\}$$

$$\leq \frac{A_0 B_0^{l+1} e^{-\beta|k|}}{(1+|k|)^\mu (2l+3)^2} Q_{2l+2}(\beta|k|)$$

for large enough B_0 so that

$$\left\{ \frac{6}{\beta^2} B_0 + 2^{\mu} \frac{18\pi}{\beta^3} B_0 \|v_0\|_{\mu,\beta} + \frac{2^{\mu} 18\pi}{\beta^3} \|v_1\|_{\mu,\beta} + \frac{9 A_0 2^{\mu}}{\beta^3} \right\} \le B_0^2 \tag{3.58}$$

Combining (3.58) with (3.55) and (3.57), we that (3.54) is satisfied for any $l \ge 1$. Therefore, it follows that $\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \hat{W}^{[l]}(k) p^l$ is convergent for $|p| < \frac{1}{4B_0}$. The recurrence relations (3.50),(3.51) and (3.53) imply that $\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \hat{W}^{[l]}(k) p^l$ is indeed a solution to (2.9), which is zero at $p = 0$. However, from §2 Lemma 2.8, we know that there is a unique $\hat{W} = \hat{U}(k,p) - \hat{v}_1(k)$ with this property in $\mathcal{A}_L^{\infty}$, which for sufficiently small L includes analytic functions at the origin. Therefore

$$\hat{U}(k,p) = \hat{v}_1(k) + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \hat{W}^{[l]}(k) p^l$$

Moreover, from the well-known relation between a function and its Fourier transform, $\|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)} \le \|\hat{f}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3}$, the inequalities involving $W^{[l]}(x)$ and its x-derivatives follow.

4. Estimates on $\partial_p^l \hat{W}(k,p)$ and proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section, we find inductively (in l) that $\hat{W}^{[l]} := \partial_p^l \hat{W}/l!$ exists for any l and $\hat{W}^{[l]}$ generate power series (4.72) with p_0- independent radius of convergence. This does not necessarily imply in itself that the series converges to $\hat{W}$. The fact that these objects do coincide locally will be shown in Lemma 4.13. This leads to proof of Theorem 1.2.

Definition 4.1. *It is convenient to define for $l \ge 1$,*

$$\hat{W}^{[l]}(k,p) = \frac{1}{l!} \partial_p^l \hat{W}(x,p) \ ,$$

It is also convenient to define $\hat{W}^{[0]}(k,p) = \hat{W}(k,p) = \hat{U}(k,p) - \hat{v}_1(k)$.

The proof therefore reduces to finding appropriate bounds on $\hat{W}^{[l]}(k,p)$. The main result proved in this section is the Lemma 4.2, which, using Lemma 4.13, leads directly to the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proposition 2.9 implies that $\hat{U} \in \mathcal{A}^{\alpha'}$ for $\alpha' > \alpha$, with α chosen large enough to satisfy (2.39). In particular, if we choose $\alpha' = \alpha + 1$, it follows that $\hat{W}^{[0]}(k,p) = \hat{U}(k,p) - \hat{v}_k(k)$ satisfies

$$|\hat{W}^{[0]}(k,p)| \le \frac{3 e^{-\beta|k| + \alpha' p} \|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta}}{(1+p^2)(1+|k|)^{\mu}} \tag{4.59}$$

In the rest of this section, with some abuse of notation, we will replace α' by α.

Lemma 4.2. *If $\|v_0\|_{\mu+2,\beta} < \infty$, $\mu > 3$, there exists positive constants A, B independent of l, k and p so that for any $l \ge 0$*

$$|\hat{W}^{[l]}(k,p)| \le \frac{e^{\alpha p} e^{-\beta|k|}}{(1+p^2)(1+|k|)^{\mu}} A B^l \frac{Q_{2l}(|\beta k|)}{(2l+1)^2} \tag{4.60}$$

The series (4.72) converges uniformly for any $p_0 \ge 0$ for $|p - p_0| < \frac{1}{4B}$.

Remark 4.3. *The proof requires some further lemmas. We will use induction on* l*. Clearly, from (4.59), the conclusion is valid for* $l = 0$*, when*

$$A = 3\|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta} \tag{4.61}$$

We assume (4.60) for $l \geq 0$ *and then establish it for* $l + 1$*. We obtain a recurrence relation for* $\hat{W}^{[l+1]}(k,.)$ *for any* $k \in \mathbb{R}^3$ *in terms of* $\hat{W}^{[j]}(k,.)$ *for* $j \leq l$*.*

Taking ∂_p^l in (2.9) and dividing by $l!$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &p\partial_p^2 \hat{W}^{[l]} + (l+2)\partial_p \hat{W}^{[l]} + |k|^2 \hat{W}^{[l]} = \\ &-ik_j P_k \left[\int_0^p \left\{ \hat{W}_j^{[l]}(\cdot, p-s) \hat{*} \hat{W}^{[0]}(\cdot, s) \right\} ds + \sum_{l_1=1}^{l-1} \frac{l_1!(l-1-l_1)!}{l!} \hat{W}_j^{[l_1]}(\cdot, 0) \hat{*} \hat{W}^{[l-1-l_1]}(\cdot, p) \right] \\ &\quad - ik_j P_k \left[\hat{v}_{0,j} \hat{*} \hat{W}^{[l]} + \hat{v}_0 \hat{*} \hat{W}_j^{[l]} + \frac{1}{l} \hat{v}_{1,j} \hat{*} \hat{W}^{[l-1]} + \frac{1}{l} \hat{v}_1 \hat{*} \hat{W}_j^{[l-1]} + \hat{v}_{1,j} \hat{*} \hat{v}_1 \delta_{l,1} \right] \\ &\qquad - ik_j P_k \left[\hat{v}_{0,j} \hat{*} \hat{v}_1 + \hat{v}_{1,j} \hat{*} \hat{v}_0 \right] \delta_{l,0} \equiv \hat{R}^{(l)}(k,p) \end{aligned} \tag{4.62}$$

Lemma 4.4. *For any* $l \geq 0$*, for some absolute constant* $C_6 > 0$*, if* $\hat{W}^{[l]}(k,p)$ *satisfies (4.62) and is bounded at* $p = 0$*, then* $\hat{W}^{[l+1]}(k,p)$ *is bounded in terms of* $\hat{R}^{(l)}(k,p)$*, defined in (4.62):*

$$|\hat{W}^{[l+1]}(k,p) \leq \frac{C_6}{(l+1)^{5/3}} \sup_{p' \in [0,p]} |\hat{R}^{[l]}(k,p)| + \frac{|k|^2 |\hat{W}^{[l]}(k,0)|}{(l+1)(l+2)}$$

Proof. We invert the operator on the left hand side of (4.62). With the requirement that $\hat{W}^{[l]}$ is bounded at $p = 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{W}^{[l]}(k,p) = &\int_0^p \mathcal{Q}\left(z(p), 2|k|\sqrt{p'} \right) \hat{R}^{(l)}(k,p') dp' \\ &+ 2^{(l+1)}(l+1)! \hat{W}^{[l]}(k,0) \frac{J_{l+1}(z)}{z^{l+1}} \ , \text{ where } z = 2|k|\sqrt{p} \end{aligned} \tag{4.63}$$

and

$$\mathcal{Q}(z,z') \ = \ \pi z^{-(l+1)} \left[-J_{l+1}(z) z'^{(l+1)} Y_{l+1}(z') + z'^{(l+1)} J_{l+1}(z') Y_{l+1}(z) \right] \tag{4.64}$$

On taking the first derivative with respect to p, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &(l+1)\hat{W}^{[l+1]}(k,p) \\ &= \frac{|k|}{\sqrt{p}} \int_0^p \mathcal{Q}_z \left(2|k|\sqrt{p}, 2|k|\sqrt{p'} \right) \hat{R}^{(l)}(k,p') dp' - 2^{l+2}(l+1)! |k|^2 \frac{J_{l+2}(z)}{z^{l+2}} \hat{W}^{[l]}(k,0) \end{aligned} \tag{4.65}$$

Using again the properties of Bessel functions [1] we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{z}\mathcal{Q}_z(z,z') &= \frac{\pi}{z} \left[-\left(\frac{J_{l+1}(z)}{z^{l+1}} \right)' z'^{(l+1)} Y_{l+1}(z') + z'^{(l+1)} J_{l+1}(z') \left(\frac{Y_{l+1}(z)}{z^{l+1}} \right)' \right] \\ &= \pi \left[\frac{J_{l+2}(z)}{z^{l+2}} z'^{(l+1)} Y_{l+1}(z') - z'^{(l+1)} J_{l+1}(z') \frac{Y_{l+2}(z)}{z^{l+2}} \right] \end{aligned} \tag{4.66}$$

It is also known [1] that

$$2^{l+2}(l+1)!\Big|\frac{J_{l+2}(z)}{z^{l+2}}\Big| \le \frac{1}{(l+2)}$$

Using (4.66) and the known uniform asymptotics of Bessel functions for large l [1], it is easily to see that C_* independent of l so that

$$\int_0^z \frac{z'}{z}|Q_z(z,z')|dz' \le \frac{C_*}{(l+1)^{2/3}}$$

It follows that
(4.67)

$$(l+1)|\hat{W}^{[l+1]}(k,p)| \le \sup_{p'\in[0,p]} |\hat{R}^{(l)}(k,p')| \int_0^z \frac{z'}{z}|Q_z(z,z')|dz' + \frac{|k|^2}{(l+2)}|\hat{W}^{[l]}(k,0)|$$

Therefore, it follows that

$$\Big|\hat{W}^{[l+1]}(k,p)\Big| \le \frac{C_6}{(l+1)^{5/3}} \sup_{p'\in[0,p]} |\hat{R}^{(l)}(k,p')| + \frac{|k|^2|\hat{W}^{[l]}(k,0)|}{(l+1)(l+2)} \tag{4.68}$$

∎

Remark 4.5. *We now find bounds on the different terms in* $\hat{R}^{(l)}(k,p)$*.*

Lemma 4.6. *If* $W^{[l]}$ *satisfies (4.60), for* $l \ge 0$ *then*

$$|k_j P_k\left(\hat{v}_{0,j}\hat{*}\hat{W}^{[l]}\right)| \le C_1\|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu,\beta}\frac{(l+1)^{2/3}AB^l e^{-\beta|k|+\alpha p}Q_{2l+2}(\beta|k|)}{(2l+1)(1+|k|)^\mu(1+p^2)}$$

$$|k_j P_k\left(\hat{W}_j^{[l]}\hat{*}\hat{v}_{0,j}\right)| \le C_1\|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu,\beta}\frac{(l+1)^{2/3}AB^l e^{-\beta|k|+\alpha p}Q_{2l+2}(\beta|k|)}{(2l+1)(1+|k|)^\mu(1+p^2)}$$

Proof. We use (4.60). From Lemma 6.10, we obtain

$$(1+p^2)e^{-\alpha p}|k_j\hat{W}_j^{[l]}\hat{*}\hat{v}_0| \le \|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu,\beta}\frac{AB^l}{(2l+1)}|k|\int_{k'\in\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{e^{-\beta(|k'|+|k-k'|)}}{(1+|k'|)^\mu[1+|k-k'|)]^\mu}Q_{2l}(\beta|k'|)dk'$$

$$\le C_1(l+1)^{2/3}\|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu,\beta}\frac{AB^l}{(2l+1)}\frac{e^{-\beta|k|}}{(1+|k|)^\mu}Q_{2l+2}(\beta|k|)$$

The first part of the Lemma follows. The proof of the second part is essentially the same since $|\hat{W}_j^{[l]}| \le |\hat{W}^{[l]}|$. ∎

Lemma 4.7. *If* $W^{[l-1]}$ *satisfies (4.60) for* $l \ge 1$*, then*

$$\Big|\frac{k_j}{l}P_k\left[\hat{v}_{1,j}\hat{*}\hat{W}^{[l-1]}\right]\Big| \le C_1\|v_1\|_{\mu,\beta}AB^{l-1}\frac{e^{-\beta|k|+\alpha p}}{(1+p^2)(1+|k|)^\mu}\frac{l^{2/3}Q_{2l}(\beta|k|)}{l(2l-1)}$$

$$\Big|\frac{k_j}{l}\left(1-\frac{k(k\cdot)}{|k|^2}\right)\hat{v}_1\hat{*}\hat{W}_j^{[l-1]}\Big| \le C_1\|v_1\|_{\mu,\beta}AB^{l-1}\frac{e^{-\beta|k|+\alpha p}}{(1+p^2)(1+|k|)^\mu}\frac{l^{2/3}Q_{2l}(\beta|k|)}{l(2l-1)}$$

Proof. The proof is identical to Lemma 4.6 replacing l by $l-1$ and $\hat{v}_0$ by $\hat{v}_1$. ∎

Lemma 4.8. *If* $W^{[l]}$ *satisfies (4.60), then for* $l \ge 1$*,*

$$\Big|\frac{k_j}{l}P_k\left[\hat{W}^{[l-1]}(\cdot,0)\hat{*}\hat{W}^{[0]}(\cdot,p)\right]\Big| \le C_1\frac{(l+1)^{2/3}A^2B^{l-1}e^{-\beta|k|+\alpha p}Q_{2l}(\beta|k|)}{l(2l-1)(1+|k|)^\mu(1+p^2)}$$

Proof. Noting that

$$|\hat{W}^{[0]}(k,p)| \leq A \frac{e^{-\beta|k|+\alpha p}}{(1+|k|)^{\mu}(1+p^2)}$$

and

$$|\hat{W}^{[l-1]}(k,0) \leq \frac{e^{-\beta|k|}}{(2l-1)^2(1+|k|)^{\mu}} A B^{l-1} Q_{2l-2}(\beta|k|)$$

the rest of the proof is very similar to the proof of Lemma 4.6 ∎

Lemma 4.9. *If* $\hat{W}^{[l_1]}$ *and* $\hat{W}^{[l-1-l_1]}$ *for* $l_1 = 1, ..(l-2)$ *for* $l \geq 2$ *satisfy (4.60), then*

$$\Big| k_j P_k \left[\sum_{l_1=1}^{l-2} \frac{l_1!(l-1-l_1)!}{l!} \hat{W}_j^{[l_1]}(\cdot,0) \hat{*} \hat{W}^{[l-1-l_1]}(\cdot,p) \right] \Big|$$
$$\leq C_8 2^{\mu+1} \pi A^2 B^{l-1} \frac{e^{-\beta|k|+\alpha p}}{3\beta^3(1+p^2)(1+|k|)^{-\mu}} \frac{l Q_{2l}(\beta|k|)}{(2l+3)^2} \ ; \ \text{where } C_8 = 82$$

Proof. First note that if we define $l_2 = l-1-l_1$, then for $l \geq 2$, using Lemma 6.9, we get

$$\frac{l_1! l_2!}{l!} |k_j \hat{W}_j^{[l_1]}(\cdot,0) \hat{*} \hat{W}^{[l_2]}(\cdot,p)| \leq \frac{e^{\alpha p}}{(1+p^2)} A^2 B^{l-1} \frac{l_1! l_2!}{l!(2l_1+1)^2(2l_2+1)^2}$$
$$\times |k| \int_{k' \in \mathbb{R}^3} e^{-\beta(|k'|+|k-k'|)} (1+|k'|)^{-\mu} (1+|k-k'|)^{-\mu} Q_{2l_1}(\beta|k'|) Q_{2l_2}(\beta|k-k'|) dk'$$
$$\leq \frac{A^2 B^{l-1} 2^{\mu+1} \pi e^{-\beta|k|+\alpha p}}{3\beta^3 (1+p^2)(1+|k|)^{\mu}} \frac{l_1! l_2! (2l)(2l-1)(2l+1)}{l!(2l_1+1)^2(2l_2+1)^2} Q_{2l}(\beta|k|)$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{l_1=1}^{l-2} \frac{l_1! l_2!}{l!} |k_j \hat{W}_j^{[l_1]}(.;0) \hat{*} \hat{W}^{[l_2]}(.;p)|$$
$$\leq \frac{2^{\mu} A^2 B^l e^{-\beta|k|+\alpha p} Q_{2l}(\beta|k|)}{\beta^3 (1+|k|)^{\mu}(1+p^2)} \sum_{l_1=1}^{l-2} \frac{l_1! l_2! (2l)(2l+1)(2l-1)}{l!(2l_1+1)^2(2l_2+1)^2}$$

We claim that for $l \geq 2$, with $l_1 \geq 1$, $l_2 = l - l_1 - 1 \geq 1$,

$$\sum_{l_1=1}^{l-1} \frac{l_1! l_2! (2l)(2l-1)(2l+1)}{l!(l-1)(2l_1+1)^2(2l_2+1)^2} \leq \frac{C_8 l}{(2l+3)^2}$$

for some C_8 independent of l; C_8 is bounded by 82.

Proving the above bound only requires consideration for sufficiently large l. We will therefore assume $l \geq 5$. Further, consider summation terms other than $l_1 = 1$ and $l_2 = 1$. So, we may assume $l_1, l_2 \geq 2$. Then, we claim that

$$\frac{l_1! l_2! 2l(2l+1)(2l-1)}{l!(2l_1+1)^2(2l_2+1)^2} = \left(\frac{(l_1-2)!(l_2-2)!}{(l-5)!} \right) \left(\frac{l_1(l_1-1) l_2(l_2-1)}{(2l_1+1)^2(2l_2+2)^2} \right) \times$$
$$\left(\frac{2l(2l-1)(2l+1)}{l(l-1)(l-2)(l-3)(l-4)} \right) \leq \frac{12}{(2l+3)^2} \tag{4.69}$$

This follows since the first two parenthesis term on the right of (4.69) is clearly bounded, while the last term is a cubic in l divided by fifth order polynomial, and simple estimates give the upperbound of 12. Therefore, for $l \geq 5$,

$$\sum_{l_1=2}^{l-3} \frac{l_1! l_2! 2l(2l+1)(2l-1)}{l!(2l_1+1)^2(2l_2+1)^2} \leq 12 \frac{(l-4)}{(2l+3)^2}$$

For $l_1 = 1$ or $l_2 = 1$, clearly

$$\frac{l_1! l_2! 2l(2l+1)(2l-1)}{l!(2l_1+1)^2(2l_2+1)^2} = \frac{(l-2)! 2l(2l+1)(2l-1)}{9 l! (2l-3)^2} = \frac{2l(2l+1)(2l-1)}{9l(l-1)(2l-3)^2} \leq 82 \frac{l}{(2l+3)^2}$$

∎

Lemma 4.10. *If* $\hat{W}^{[l]}$ *satisfies (4.60), then for* $l \geq 0$,

$$\left| k_j \left(1 - \frac{k(k\cdot)}{|k|^2} \right) \int_0^p \hat{W}_j^{[l]}(.;p-s) \hat{*} \hat{W}^{[0]}(.;s) ds \right| \leq C_1 (l+1)^{2/3} A^2 B^l \frac{e^{-\beta|k|+\alpha p} Q_{2l+2}(\beta|k|)}{(1+p^2)(1+|k|)^{\mu}(2l+1)}$$

Proof. We note that Lemma 6.10 implies

$$\left| k_j \int_{k' \in \mathbb{R}^3} \int_0^p \hat{W}_j^{[l]}(k', p-s) \hat{W}^{[0]}(k-k';s) ds dk' \right| \leq \frac{A^2 B^l e^{\alpha p}}{(1+p^2)(2l+1)^2} \times |k'| \int_{k' \in \mathbb{R}^3} \frac{e^{-\beta|k'|-\beta|k-k'|}}{(1+|k'|)^{\mu}(1+|k-k'|)^{\mu}} Q_{2l}(\beta k') dk' \leq \frac{C_1 (l+1)^{2/3} A^2 B^l e^{\alpha p - \beta|k|}}{(2l+1)(1+p^2)(1+|k|)^{\mu}} Q_{2l+2}(\beta|k|)$$

∎

Lemma 4.11.

$$\left| k_j \left(1 - \frac{k(k \cdot .)}{|k|^2} \right) (\hat{v}_{0,j} \hat{*} \hat{v}_1 + \hat{v}_{1,j} \hat{*} \hat{v}_0) \right| \leq 4 C_0 |k| \frac{e^{-\beta|k|}}{(1+|k|)^{\mu}} \|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu,\beta} \|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta}$$

$$\left| k_j \left(1 - \frac{k(k \cdot .)}{|k|^2} \right) \hat{v}_{1,j} \hat{*} \hat{v}_1 \right| \leq 2 C_0 |k| \frac{e^{-\beta|k|}}{(1+|k|)^{\mu}} \|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta}^2$$

Proof. This follows simply from the observation that

$$\left| k_j \left(1 - \frac{k(k \cdot .)}{|k|^2} \right) \hat{v}_{0,j} \hat{*} \hat{v}_1 \right| \leq 2|k| \|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta} \|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu,\beta} \int_{k' \in \mathbb{R}^3} \frac{e^{-\beta|k'|-\beta|k-k'|}}{(1+|k'|)^{\mu}(1+|k-k'|)^{\mu}} dk'$$

and using (2.21) to bound the convolution. Other parts of the Lemma follow similarly. ∎

Lemma 4.12.

$$|\hat{W}^{[1]}(\cdot, p)| \leq \frac{e^{-\beta|k|+\alpha p}}{(1+|k|)^{\mu}(1+p^2)} A B Q_2(\beta|k|)$$

with

$$AB \geq \left(2 C_1 \|v_0\|_{\mu,\beta} A + C_1 A^2 + \frac{2C_0}{\beta} \|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu,\beta} \|v_1\|_{\mu,\beta} \right) \tag{4.70}$$

Proof. Combining Lemmas 4.6, 4.10 and 4.11 with (4.68) for $l = 0$, we obtain

$$|\hat{W}^{[1]}(\cdot,p)| \leq \frac{e^{-\beta|k|+\alpha p}}{(1+|k|)^{\mu}(1+p^2)} Q_2(\beta|k|) \left(2C_1\|v_0\|_{\mu,\beta} A + C_1 A^2 + \frac{2C_0}{\beta}\|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu,\beta}\|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta} \right)$$

$$\leq \frac{e^{-\beta|k|+\alpha p}}{(1+|k|)^{\mu}(1+p^2)} AB Q_2(\beta|k|)$$

∎

Proof of Lemma 4.2

From Lemmas 4.6-4.10 and 4.11 (the latter is only needed for $l = 1$), it follows that $\hat{R}^{(l)}$ (cf. (4.60)) satisfies

$$|\hat{R}^{(l)}| \leq AB^{l-1} \frac{e^{-\beta|k|+\alpha p}}{(2l+3)^2(1+p^2)(1+|k|)^{\mu}} Q_{2l+2}(\beta|k|)$$
$$\times \Bigg[ABC_1 \frac{(l+1)^{2/3}(2l+3)^2}{(2l+1)} + \frac{AC_1(l+1)^{2/3}(2l+3)^3}{4l(2l-1)} + \frac{82\ 2^{\mu+1}\pi A l}{12\beta^3} + \frac{2C_1\|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta}(2l+3)^3}{4l^{1/3}(2l-1)}$$
$$+ \frac{2C_0(l+1)^{2/3}(2l+3)^2\|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu,\beta}}{(2l+1)} + \frac{25C_0}{\beta}(1+p^2)e^{-\alpha p}\|\hat{v}_1\|^2_{\mu,\beta}\delta_{l,1} \Bigg]$$

Noting that $e^{-\alpha p}(1+p^2) \leq 1$ and

$$\sup_{p' \in [0,p]} \frac{e^{\alpha p'}}{1+p'^2} = \frac{e^{\alpha p}}{1+p^2}$$

for $\alpha \geq 1$, it follows from Lemma 4.4 and the above bounds that (4.60) holds when l is replaced by $l+1$, provided B is chosen large enough to satisfy (4.70) and

(4.71)

$$C_6 \Bigg[ABC_1 \frac{(2l+3)^2}{(l+1)(2l+1)} + \frac{AC_1(2l+3)^3}{4l(l+1)(2l-1)} + \frac{(82)2^{\mu+1}\pi A l}{12\beta^3(l+1)^{5/3}} + \frac{2C_1\|\hat{v}_1\|_{\mu,\beta}(2l+3)^3}{4l^{1/3}(l+1)^{5/3}(2l-1)}$$
$$+ \frac{2C_0(2l+3)^2\|\hat{v}_0\|_{\mu,\beta}}{(l+1)(2l+1)} + \frac{25C_0}{\beta}(1+p^2)e^{-\alpha p}\|\hat{v}_1\|^2_{\mu,\beta}\delta_{l,1} \Bigg] + \frac{100B}{9\beta^2} \leq B^2,$$

for any $l \geq 1$, with A given by (4.61). From the asymptotic behavior of the left hand side of (4.71) as $l \to \infty$ and recalling that constants C_0, C_1 and C_6 are independent of l, it follows that B can be chosen independent of l. Therefore, by induction, (4.60) follows for all l. The proof of Lemma 4.2 is complete.

From (4.60), after noting that that $Q_{2l}(|q|) \leq 4^l e^{-|q|/2}$, it follows that

$$\tilde{W}(k,p;p_0) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \hat{W}^{[l]}(k,p_0)(p-p_0)^l := \hat{W}_1(k,p) \tag{4.72}$$

is convergent for $|p-p_0| < \frac{1}{4B}$ for B independent of $p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+$. The following Lemma shows that $\tilde{W}(k,p;p_0)$ is indeed the local representation of the solution $\hat{W}(k,p)$ to (2.9).

Lemma 4.13. *The unique solution to (2.9) satisfying $\hat{W}(k,0) = 0$, given by $\hat{W}(k,p) = \hat{U}(k,p) - \hat{v}_1(k)$, where $\hat{U}(k,p)$ is determined in §2 in Lemma 2.8, has the* *local representation* $\tilde{W}(k,p;p_0)$ *in a neighborhood of* $p_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+$. *Therefore,* $\hat{W}(k,.)$ *(and therefore* $\hat{U}(k,.)$*) is analytic in* $\mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$.

Proof. First, by permanence of relations (for analyticity of convolutions, see e.g., [5]), it follows that if $\hat{V}$ is an analytic solution of an equation of the form (2.9) on an interval $[0,L]$ and $\hat{V}$ has analytic continuation on $[0,L']$ with $L' > L$, then the equation is automatically satisfied in the larger interval. Therefore, if we analytically continue $\hat{W}$ to $\mathbb{R}^+$, the analytic continuation will automatically satisfy (2.9) and will therefore be the same as $\hat{W}(k,p)$.

From §3, Lemma 3.2, we know that the actual solution to (2.9) satisfying $\hat{W}(k,0) = 0$, is unique, and given by

$$\hat{W}(k,p) = \tilde{W}(k,p;0)$$

for $|p| < (4B)^{-1}$.

We now choose a sequence of $\{p_{0,j}\}_{j=0}^{\infty}$, with $p_{0,j} = j/(8B)$ and define the intervals $\mathcal{I}_j = (p_{0,j} - 1/(4B), p_{0,j} + 1/(4B))$. Consider the sequence of analytic functions $\left\{\tilde{W}(k,p;p_{0,j})\right\}_{j=0}^{\infty}$. Since $p_{0,1} \in \mathcal{I}_0 \cap \mathcal{I}_1$, it follows from (4.72) that $\hat{W}(k,p)$ has analytic continuation to $\mathcal{I}_1$, namely $\tilde{W}(k,p;p_{0,1})$. Again $p_{0,2} \in \mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{I}_2$. Hence $\tilde{W}(k,p;p_{0,2})$ provides analytic continuation of $\hat{W}(k,p)$ to the interval $\mathcal{I}_2$. We can continue this process to obtain analytic continuation of $\hat{W}$ to any interval $\mathcal{I}_j$. Since the union of $\{\mathcal{I}_j\}_{j=0}^{\infty}$ contains $\mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$, it follows that $\hat{W}(k,.)$ is analytic in $\mathbb{R}^+$. In particular, (4.72) provides the local Taylor series representation of $\hat{W}(k,p)$ near $p = p_0$. ∎

Proof of Theorem 1.2

Using Lemma 4.2, it follows from the inequality $\|W^{[l]}(\cdot,p_0)\|_\infty \leq \|\hat{W}^{[l]}(\cdot,p_0)\|_{\mathbb{L}^1}$ by integration in k that

$$|W^{[l]}(x,p_0)| \leq \frac{8\pi A(4B)^l e^{\alpha p_0}}{\beta(2l+1)^2(1+p_0^2)}$$

$$|DW^{[l]}(x,p_0)| \leq \frac{8\pi A(4B)^l e^{\alpha p_0}}{\beta(2l+1)^2(1+p_0^2)}$$

$$|D^2W^{[l]}(x,p_0)| \leq \frac{16\pi A(4B)^l e^{\alpha p_0}}{\beta^2(2l+1)^2(1+p_0^2)}$$

and therefore, the series (4.72) converges for $|p-p_0| < B^{-1}/4$ and, from Lemma 4.13 it is the local representation of the solution $\hat{W}(k,p)$ to (2.9) satisfying $\hat{W}(k,0) = 0$ for any $p_0 \geq 0$. These estimates on W in terms of $\hat{W}$, and the fact that $W(x,p)$ is analytic in a neighborhood of for $p \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{R}^+$ and is exponentially bounded in p for large p (recall $\hat{W} \in \mathcal{A}^\alpha$) implies Borel summability of v in $1/t$. Watson's Lemma [21] implies $w(x,t) = \int_0^\infty e^{-p/t} W(x,p) dp \sim \sum_{m=2}^\infty v_m(x) t^m$, implying

$$v(x,t) = v_0(x) + t v_1(x) + \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} v_m(x) t^m,$$

where $v_m(x) = m!W^{[m-1]}(x;0) = m!U^{[m-1]}(x;0)$ for $m \geq 2$. It follows from the bounds on $\hat{W}^{[m-1]}(k)$ in §3, that for $m \geq 2$, $|W^{[m-1]}(x;0)| \leq A_0 B_0^m$, where A_0 and B_0[(4)] are chosen to ensure (3.55), (3.57) and (3.58).

5. Acknowledgments.

The authors benefitted from comments by Peter Constantin and Charlie Doering. This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation (DMS-0406193, DMS-0601226, DMS-0600369 to OC and (DMS-0405837 to S.T). Additional support was provided to ST by the Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Imperial College and the EPSRC.

6. Appendix

6.1. Some Fourier convolution inequalities.

The following lemmas are relatively straightforward.

Definition 6.1. *Consider the polynomial*

$$P_n(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{n!}{j!} z^j$$

Remark 6.2. *Integration by parts yields*

$$\int_0^z e^{-\tau} \tau^n d\tau = -e^{-z} P_n(z) + n! \tag{6.73}$$

Lemma 6.3. *For all $y \geq 0$ and nonnegative integers $m, n \geq 0$ we have*

$$y^{m+1} \int_0^1 \rho^m P_n(y(1-\rho)) d\rho = m!n! \sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{y^{m+j+1}}{(m+j+1)!}$$

Proof. This follows from a simple computation:

$$y^{m+1} \int_0^1 \rho^m P_n(y(1-\rho)) d\rho = \sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{n!}{j!} y^{j+m+1} \int_0^1 (1-\rho)^j \rho^m d\rho = m!n! \sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{y^{j+m+1}}{(m+j+1)!}$$

∎

Lemma 6.4. *For all $y \geq 0$ and nonnegative integers $n \geq m \geq 0$ we have*

$$y^{m+1} \int_1^\infty e^{-2y(\rho-1)} \rho^m P_n(y(\rho-1)) d\rho \leq 2^{-m}(m+n)! \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{y^j}{j!}$$

Proof. First we note that

$$y^{m+1+l} \int_1^\infty e^{-2y(\rho-1)} \rho^m (\rho-1)^l d\rho = y^{m+1+l} \int_0^\infty e^{-2y\rho} (1+\rho)^m \rho^l d\rho$$

$$= y^{m+1+l} \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{m!}{j!(m-j)!} \int_0^\infty e^{-2y\rho} \rho^{l+j} d\rho = 2^{-l-1} \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{y^{m-j} m!(l+j)!}{j!(m-j)!2^j}$$

$$= 2^{-l-1} \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{y^j m!(l+m-j)!}{(m-j)!j!2^{m-j}}$$

[(4)] We may express it in terms of A and B as well, however, the estimates A_0 and B_0 found in §3, are better.

Therefore, from the definition of P_n, it follows that

$$y^{m+1}\int_1^\infty e^{-2y(\rho-1)}\rho^m P_n(y(\rho-1))d\rho$$
$$= m!n!\sum_{j=0}^m \frac{y^j}{j!(m-j)!2^{m-j}}\left(\sum_{l=0}^n \frac{(l+m-j)!}{2^{l+1}l!}\right)$$

Taking the ratio of two consecutive terms we see that $(l+m-j)!/l!$ is nondecreasing with l since $m-j\geq 0$. Therefore the $l=n$ term is the largest term in the summation over l. Further, $\sum_{l=0}^n 2^{-l-1}\leq 1$. Therefore, $\sum_{l=0}^n 2^{-l-1}(l+m-j)!/l!\leq (m-j+n)!/n!$, and hence

$$y^{m+1}\int_1^\infty e^{-2y(\rho-1)}\rho^m P_n(y(\rho-1))d\rho \leq 2^{-m}m!n!\sum_{j=0}^m \frac{y^j}{j!}\frac{2^j(m-j+n)!}{n!(m-j)!}$$

The ratio of two consecutive (in j) terms in $2^j(m-j+n)!/(m-j)!$ is ≤ 1 for $m\leq n$, hence the largest value is attained at $j=0$ and thus

$$y^{m+1}\int_1^\infty e^{-2y(\rho-1)}\rho^m P_n(y(\rho-1))d\rho \leq 2^{-m}(m+n)!\sum_{j=0}^m \frac{y^j}{j!}$$

∎

Lemma 6.5. *For all $y\geq 0$ and nonnegative integers $n\geq m\geq 0$ we have*

$$y^{m+1}\int_0^\infty e^{-y(\rho-1)[1+sgn(\rho-1)]}\rho^m P_n(y|1-\rho|)d\rho \leq m!n!Q_{m+n+1}(y)$$

Proof. By breaking up the integral range into $\int_0^1$ and $\int_1^\infty$ and using the two previous Lemmas, we obtain

$$y^{m+1}\int_0^\infty e^{-y(\rho-1)[1+\mathrm{sgn}(\rho-1)]}\rho^m P_n(y|1-\rho|)d\rho \leq m!n!\Bigg(\sum_{j=m+1}^{m+n+1}\frac{y^j}{j!}$$
$$+ 2^{-m-n}\frac{(m+n)!}{m!n!}\sum_{j=0}^m 2^n\frac{y^j}{j!}\Bigg) \leq m!n!\sum_{j=0}^{m+n+1} 2^{m+n+1-j}\frac{y^j}{j!} = m!n!Q_{m+n+1}(y)$$

where we used $2^{-m-n}\frac{(m+n)!}{m!n!}\leq 1$. ∎

Lemma 6.6. *If m and n, are integers no less that -1 we obtain*

$$|q|\int_{q'\in\mathbb{R}^3} e^{|q|-|q'|-|q-q'|}|q'|^m|q-q'|^n dq' \leq 2\pi(m+1)!(n+1)!Q_{m+n+3}(|q|)$$

Proof. We note that we may assume $m\leq n$ without loss of generality since changing variable $q'\mapsto q-q'$ switches the roles of m and n.

First, we will show that

$$\frac{|q|}{2\pi}\int_{q'\in\mathbb{R}^3} e^{|q|-|q'|-|q-q'|}|q'|^m|q-q'|^n dq' \tag{6.74}$$
$$\leq |q|^{m+2}\int_0^\infty e^{-|q|(\rho-1)[1+\mathrm{sgn}(\rho-1)]}\rho^{m+1}P_{n+1}(|q|(|\rho-1|)d\rho$$

We scale q' with $|q|$ and use a polar representation (ρ, θ, ϕ) for $q'/|q|$, where θ is the angle between q and q'. As a variable of integration however, we prefer to use $z = \sqrt{1+\rho^2 - 2\rho\cos\theta}$ to θ. Then, it is clear that

$$|q - q'| = |q|\sqrt{1+\rho^2-2\rho\cos\theta} = |q|z, \text{ and } dz = \frac{\rho\sin\theta d\theta}{\sqrt{1+\rho^2-2\rho\cos\theta}}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}&|q|\int_{q'\in\mathbb{R}^3} e^{|q|-|q'|-|q-q'|}|q'|^m|q-q'|^n dq' \\ &\qquad = 2\pi|q|^{m+n+4}\int_0^\infty d\rho\rho^{m+1}e^{-|q|(\rho-1)}\left\{\int_{|\rho-1|}^{1+\rho} dz e^{-|q|z}z^{n+1}\right\} \\ &= 2\pi|q|^{m+2}\int_0^\infty d\rho\rho^{m+1}e^{-|q|(\rho-1)}\Big[e^{-|q||\rho-1|}P_{n+1}(|q||\rho-1|) - e^{-|q|(1+\rho)}P_{n+1}(|q|(1+\rho))\Big]\end{aligned}$$

Inequality (6.74) follows since $e^{-|q|(1+\rho)}P_{n+1}(|q|(1+\rho)) \ge 0$. The rest of the Lemma follows from Lemma 6.5, with $y = |q|$, and m replaced by $m+1$, n by $n+1$ respectively. ▮

Lemma 6.7. *For any $\mu \ge 1$, and nonnegative integers m, n we have*

$$\begin{aligned}&|k|\int_{k'\in\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{e^{-\beta[|k'|+|k-k'|]}}{(1+|k'|)^\mu(1+|k-k'|)^\mu}|\beta k'|^m|\beta(k-k')|^n dk' \\ &\qquad\qquad \le \frac{\pi 2^{\mu+1}e^{-\beta|k|}m!n!}{\beta^3(1+|k|)^\mu}(m+n+2)Q_{m+n+2}(\beta|k|)\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We break up the integral into two ranges:

$$\int_{|k'|\le|k|/2} + \int_{|k'|>|k|/2} \tag{6.75}$$

In the first integral we have

$$\frac{1}{(1+|k-k'|)^\mu(1+|k'|)^\mu} \le \frac{1}{(1+|k|/2)^\mu(1+|k'|)} \le \frac{\beta}{(1+|k|/2)^\mu|\beta k'|}$$

While in the second integral we have

$$\frac{1}{(1+|k-k'|)^\mu(1+|k'|)^\mu} \le \frac{1}{(1+|k|/2)^\mu(1+|k-k'|)} \le \frac{\beta}{(1+|k|/2)^\mu|\beta(k-k')|}$$

Introducing in the first integral $q = \beta k$ and $q' = \beta k'$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&|k|\int_{|k'|\le|k|/2}\frac{e^{-\beta[|k'|+|k-k'|]}}{(1+|k'|)^\mu(1+|k-k'|)^\mu}|\beta k'|^m|\beta(k-k')|^n dk' \\ &\qquad\qquad \le \frac{2^\mu e^{-\beta|k|}}{\beta^3(1+|k|)^\mu}|q|\int_{q'\in\mathbb{R}^3} e^{-|q'|-|q-q'|+|q|}|q'|^{m-1}|q-q'||^n dq'\end{aligned}$$

while in the second integral, with $q = \beta k$ and $q - q' = \beta k'$, we obtain

$$|k| \int_{|k'|>|k|/2} \frac{e^{-\beta[|k'|+|k-k'|]}}{(1+|k'|)^\mu (1+|k-k'|)^\mu} |\beta k'|^m |\beta(k-k')|^n dk'$$
$$\le \frac{2^\mu e^{-\beta|k|}}{\beta^3 (1+|k|)^\mu} |q| \int_{q'\in\mathbb{R}^3} e^{-|q'|-|q-q'|+|q|} |q'|^{n-1} |q-q'|^m dq'$$

We now use Lemma 6.6 to bound the first integral, with m replaced by $m-1$. We also use Lemma 6.6 to bound the second integral, with $n-1$ replacing n. The proof is completed by adding the two bounds. ∎

Lemma 6.8. *For any $\mu \ge 2$, and $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ we have*

$$|k| \int_{k'\in\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{e^{-\beta[|k'|+|k-k'|]}}{(1+|k'|)^\mu (1+|k-k'|)^\mu} |\beta(k-k')|^n dk'$$
$$\le \frac{2^{\mu+1}\pi e^{-\beta|k|}}{\beta^2 (1+|k|)^\mu} \left\{ (n-1)! Q_{n+1}(|q|) + \frac{3(n+1)!|q|^{2/3}}{2\beta^{2/3}} \sum_{j=0}^{n+1} \frac{|q|^j}{j!} \right\}$$

Proof. We break up the integral into $\int_{|k'|<|k|/2} + \int_{|k'|\ge|k|/2}$. In the first integration range we have $[1+|k-k'|]^{-\mu} \le 2^\mu [1+|k|]^{-\mu}$, whereas in the second range $[1+|k'|]^{-\mu} \le 2^\mu [1+|k|]^{-\mu}$. Therefore, using Lemma 6.6,

$$|k| \int_{|k'|\ge|k|/2} \frac{e^{-\beta[|k'|+|k-k'|]}}{(1+|k'|)^\mu (1+|k-k'|)^\mu} |\beta(k-k')|^n dk'$$
$$\le \frac{2^\mu e^{-\beta|k|}}{\beta^2 (1+|k|)^\mu} |q| \int_{q\in\mathbb{R}^3} e^{-|q'|-|q-q'|+|q|}\ |q-q'|^{n-2} dq' \le \frac{2^{\mu+1}\pi e^{-\beta|k|}}{\beta^2 (1+|k|)^\mu} (n-1)! Q_{n+1}(|q|)$$

On the other hand, using $(1+|k'|)^{-\mu} \le (1+|k'|)^{-2+2/3} \le |k'|^{-2+2/3}$ we get

$$|k| \int_{|k'|<k|/2} \frac{e^{-\beta[|k'|+|k-k'|]}}{(1+|k'|)^\mu (1+|k-k'|)^\mu} |\beta(k-k')|^n dk'$$
$$\le \frac{2^\mu e^{-\beta|k|}}{\beta^{2+2/3} (1+|k|)^\mu} |q| \int_{|q'|\le|q|/2} |q'|^{-2+2/3} e^{-|q'|-|q-q'|+|q|}\ |q-q'|^n dq'$$

We note that

$$\frac{|q|}{2\pi} \int_{|q'|<|q|/2} |q'|^{-2+2/3} e^{-|q'|-|q-q'|+|q|}\ |q-q'|^n dq'$$
$$= |q|^{n+2+2/3} \int_0^{1/2} \rho^{-1+2/3} e^{-|q|(\rho-1)} \left\{ \int_{1-\rho}^{1+\rho} dz e^{-|q|z} z^{n+1} \right\} d\rho$$
$$\le |q|^{2/3} \int_0^{1/2} \rho^{-1+2/3} P_{n+1}(|q|(1-\rho) d\rho$$
$$\le |q|^{2/3} \sum_{j=0}^{n+1} \frac{(n+1)!}{j!} |q|^j \int_0^1 \rho^{-1/3} (1-\rho)^j d\rho \le \frac{3}{2} |q|^{2/3} (n+1)! \sum_{j=0}^{n+1} \frac{|q|^j}{j!}$$

∎

Lemma 6.9. *For any $\mu \geq 1$ and nonnegative integers $l_1, l_2 \geq 0$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned}(6.76)\quad |k| &\int_{k' \in \mathbb{R}^3} \frac{e^{-\beta[|k'|+|k-k'|]}}{(1+|k'|)^\mu (1+|k-k'|)^\mu} Q_{2l_1}(|\beta k'|) Q_{2l_2}(|\beta(k-k')|) dk' \\ &\leq \frac{2^{\mu+1}\pi e^{-\beta|k}}{3\beta^3(1+|k|)^\mu}(2l_1+2l_2+1)(2l_1+2l_2+2)(2l_1+2l_2+3)Q_{2l_1+2l_2+2}(\beta|k|)\end{aligned}$$

Proof. As before, we define $q = \beta k$. Also, for notational convenience, we define

$$k^m \bowtie k^n = |k| \int_{k' \in \mathbb{R}^3} \frac{e^{-\beta[|k'|+|k-k'|]}}{(1+|k'|)^\mu (1+|k-k'|)^\mu} |\beta k'|^m |\beta(k-k')|^n dk'$$

$$K = \frac{2^{\mu+1}\pi e^{-\beta|k|}}{\beta^3(1+|k|)^\mu}$$

Lemma 6.7 and $2^{2l_1+2l_2+2-(j+2)}Q_{j+2}(|q|) \leq Q_{2l_1+2l_2+2}$ for $j \leq 2l_1+2l_2$ imply that the left side of (6.76) is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{m=0}^{2l_1}\sum_{n=0}^{2l_2} \frac{2^{2l_1+2l_2-m-n}}{m!n!} k^m \bowtie k^n &\leq K \sum_{m=0}^{2l_1}\sum_{n=0}^{2l_2} 2^{2l_1+2l_2-m-n}(m+n+2)Q_{m+n+2}(\beta|k|) \\ &\leq K \sum_{j=0}^{2l_1+2l_2} 2^{2l_1+2l_2+2-(j+2)}(j+2)(j+1)Q_{j+2}(|q|) \\ &\leq K Q_{2l_1+2l_2+2}(|q|) \sum_{j=0}^{2l_2+2l_1}(j+1)(j+2) \\ &\leq \frac{K}{3}(2l_1+2l_2+1)(2l_1+2l_2+2)(2l_1+2l_2+3)Q_{2l_1+2l_2+2}(|q|),\end{aligned}$$

which imply the result. ∎

Lemma 6.10. *If $\mu \geq 2$ and $l \geq 0$, then*

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{|k|}{(l+1)^{2/3}} \int_{k' \in \mathbb{R}^3} \frac{e^{-\beta[|k'|+|k-k'|]}}{(1+|k'|)^\mu (1+|k-k'|)^\mu} Q_{2l}(|\beta(k-k')|) dk' \\ \leq \frac{C_1 e^{-\beta|k}}{(1+|k|)^\mu}(2l+1)Q_{2l+2}(\beta|k|),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_1 = 12\pi 2^\mu \beta^{-8/3} + 2\pi 2^\mu \beta^{-2} + \frac{1}{2}C_0(\mu)\beta^{-1}$$

Proof. The case $l = 0$ follows easily by using (2.21) and the fact that

$$|k| = \beta^{-1}|q| \leq \frac{1}{2}\beta^{-1}Q_2(|q|)$$

For $l \geq 1$, it is convenient to separate out the constant term 2^{2l} in Q_{2l} and note that from (2.21) and the definition of $Q_n(z)$ we have

$$|k| \int_{k' \in \mathbb{R}^3} \frac{e^{-\beta[|k'|+|k-k'|]}}{(1+|k'|)^\mu (1+|k-k'|)^\mu} 2^{2l} dk' \leq \frac{C_0|k|e^{-\beta|k|}}{(1+|k|)^\mu} 2^{2l} \leq \frac{C_0 e^{-\beta|k|}}{2\beta(1+|k|)^\mu} Q_{2l}(\beta|k|)$$

As in previous Lemma, for notational convenience, we define

$$k^m \bowtie k^n = |k| \int_{k' \in \mathbb{R}^3} \frac{e^{-\beta[|k'|+|k-k'|]}}{(1+|k'|)^\mu (1+|k-k'|)^\mu} |\beta k'|^m |\beta(k-k')|^n dk'$$

Then, it is clear from Lemma 6.8 that

$$[Q_{2l}(\beta|k|) - 2^{2l}] \bowtie k^0 = \sum_{n=1}^{2l} \frac{2^{2l-n}}{n!} k^n \hat{*} k^0$$

$$\leq \frac{2^{\mu+1}\pi e^{-\beta|k|}}{\beta^2(1+|k|)^\mu} \sum_{n=1}^{2l} \frac{2^{2l-n}}{n!} \left\{ (n-1)! \sum_{j=0}^{n+1} \frac{2^{n+1-j}(\beta|k|)^j}{j!} + \frac{3(n+1)!|q|^{2/3}}{2\beta^{2/3}} \sum_{j=0}^{n+1} \frac{(\beta|k|)^j}{j!} \right\}$$

$$\leq \frac{2^{\mu+1}\pi e^{-\beta|k|}}{\beta^2(1+|k|)^\mu} \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{2l+1} \frac{2^{2l+1-j}(\beta|k|)^j}{j!} \sum_{n'=\max\{j,2\}}^{2l+1} \frac{(n'-2)!}{(n'-1)!} \right.$$

$$\left. + \frac{3|q|^{2/3}}{\beta^{2/3}2} \sum_{j=0}^{2l+1} \frac{2^{2l+1-j}(\beta|k|)^j}{j!} \sum_{n'=\max\{j,2\}}^{2l+1} 2^{j-n'} n' \right\}$$

$$\leq \frac{2^{\mu+1}\pi e^{-\beta|k|}}{\beta^3(1+|k|)^\mu} \left[\beta Q_{2l+1}(\beta|k|) \log(2l+2) + 3(2l+1)\beta^{1/3}|\beta k|^{2/3} Q_{2l+1}(\beta|k|) \right]$$

The lemma follows since $\log(2l+2)/(2l+1) \leq 1$, while if $|\beta k| \leq (l+1)$,

$$\left(\frac{|\beta k|}{(l+1)} \right)^{2/3} Q_{2l+1}(\beta|k|) \leq Q_{2l+1}(\beta|k|) \leq \frac{1}{2} Q_{2l+2}(\beta|k|)$$

whereas for $\beta|k| \geq (l+1)$ we have

$$\left(\frac{|\beta k|}{(l+1)} \right)^{2/3} Q_{2l+1}(\beta|k|) \leq \frac{2\beta|k|}{2l+2} Q_{2l+1}(\beta|k|) \leq 2Q_{2l+2}(\beta|k|)$$

▮

REFERENCES

[1] M Abramowitz and I A Stegun, *Handbook of mathematical functions with formulas, graphs, and mathematical tables* New York : Wiley-Interscience (1970). (See Formula 9.3.35-9.3.38 on page 365).

[2] W Balser, *From Divergent Power Series to Analytic Functions*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg (1994).

[3] J.T. Beale, T. Kato & A. Majda, "Remarks on the breakdown of smooth solutions for the 3-D Euler equations", *Comm. Math. Phys*, **94**, 61-66, 1984

[4] A. Bertozzi & A. Majda, *Vorticity and Incompressible Flow*, Cambridge U. Press, 2001.

[5] O Costin On Borel summation and Stokes phenomena for rank one nonlinear systems of ODE's *Duke Math. J. Vol. 93, No 2: 289–344, 1998*

[6] P. Constantin, "Note on loss of regularity for solutions of the 3-D incompressible Euler and related equations", *Comm. Math. Phys*, **104**, 311-329, 1986.

[7] P. Constantin & C. Fefferman, "Direction of vorticity and the problem of global regularity for the Navier-Stokes equations", *Indiana Univ. Math. J*, **42**, 775-789, 1993.

[8] P. Constantin & C. Foias, *Navier-Stokes equation*, U. Chicago Press, Chicago, 1988.

[9] C. Doering & E. Titi, "Exponential decay rate of the power spectrum for solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations", *Phys. Fluids*, **7** (6), pp 1384-1390 (1995).

[10] R. Temam, *Navier-Stokes equation*, 2nd Ed., North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1986.

[11] C. Foias & R. Temam, "Some analytic and geometric properties of the solution of the evolution Navier-Stokes equation", *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, (9), **58**, 339-68, 1979.

[12] C. Foias & R. Temam, "Gevrey Class regularity for the solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations", *J. Funct. Anal.*, **87**, 359-69, 1989.

[13] Z. Grujic & I. Kukavica, "Space analyticity for the Navier-Stokes and related equations with initial data in $\mathbf{L}^p$, *J. Funct. Anal.*, **152**, 447-66, 1999.

[14] G. Iooss, Application de la theorie des semi-groupes a l'etude de la stabilite des ecoule-ments laminaires, *J. Mecanique*, **8**, 477-507, 1969.

[15] J. Leray, Etude de diverses equations integrales non lineaires et de quelques problemes que pose l'hydrodynamique. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **12**, 1-82, 1933

[16] J. Leray, Essai sur les mouvements d'un liquide visqueux que limitent des parois, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **13**, 331-418 1934.

[17] J. Leray, Essai sur les mouvements d'un liquide visqueux emplissant l'espace. *Acta Math* **63**, 193-248., 1934

[18] On the analyticity and the unique continuation theorem for Navier-Stokes equations, *Proc. Japan Acad Ser. A Math Sci.*,**43**, 827-32, 1967.

[19] O. Costin & S. Tanveer, "Nonlinear evolution PDEs in $\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{C}^d$: existence and uniqueness of solutions, asymptotic and Borel summability properties", To appear in *Annales De L'Institut Henri Poincaré (C) Analyse Non Line'eaire*, 2006

[20] O. Costin & S. Tanveer, "Analyzability in the context of PDEs and applications", *Annales de la Faculte des Sciences de Toulouse*, **XIII**, 4, pp 439-449,2004.

[21] W. Wasow, *Asymptotic expansions for ordinary differential equations*, Interscience Publishers, 1968.